THE AJIVIKAS

By

B. M. BARUA, M.A., D.Lit.

PART I

Published by the

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

1920

THE AJIVIKAS

By

B. M. BARUA, M.A., D.Lit.

PART I

Published by the

UNIVERSITY OF CALCUTTA

1920

THE ĀJĪVIKAS

A Short History of their Religion and Philosophy

PART I

HISTORICAL SUMMARY

Introduction

The History of the Ājīvikas can broadly be divided into three periods in conformity with the three main stages of development through which their doctrines had passed. The general facts about these periods are summed up below with a view to indicate the precise nature of the problems that confront us in the study of each. The periods and problems are as follows:—

1. PRE-MAKKHALI PERIOD.

   Problems.—The rise of a religious order of wandering mendicants called the Ājīvika from a Vānaprastha or Vaikhānasa order of the hermits, hostile alike in attitude towards the religion of the Brāhmans and the Vaikhānasas, bearing yet some indelible marks of the parent āśrama; a higher synthesis in the new Bhikṣu order of the three or four āśramas of the Brāhmans.

2. MAKKHALI PERIOD.

   Problems.—Elevation of Ājīvika religion into a philosophy of life at the hands of Makkhali

Gosāla; his indebtedness to his predecessors, relations with the contemporary Sophists, and originality of conception.

3. Post-Makkhali Period.

Problems—The further development of Ājīvika religion, the process of Aryan colonisation in India, the spread of Aryan culture, the final extinction of the sect resulting from gradual transformation or absorption of the Ājīvika into the Digambara Jaina, the Shivaite and others; other causes of the decline of the faith; the influence of Ājīvika religion and philosophy on Jainism, Buddhism and Hinduism; determination of the general character of a history of Indian religion.

1. Pre-Makkhali Period.

The History of the Ājīvikas commenced, as the Buddhist records indicate,[1] with Nanda Vaccha who was succeeded in leadership of the sect by Kisa Saṁkicca. The third leader of the Ājīvikas and the greatest exponent of their religio-philosophy in the time of Buddha Gotama was Makkhali Gosāla who is often mentioned as the second in the Buddhist list of six heretical teachers.[2] In the first four Nikāyas and in the most of the Pāli texts and commentaries Nanda Vaccha and Kisa Saṁkicca are hardly more than mere names,[3] since these Buddhist sacred books keep us entirely in the dark regarding the personal history of the two teachers. It is only in the Canonical Jātaka Book and its commentary that we find the mention of a Kisa Vaccha among the seven

[1] Majjhima, I, p. 238; I, p. 524; Aṅguttara, Part III, p. 384.

[2] *E.g.*, Dīgha, I, p. 48; Majjhima, II, p. 2.

[3] Papañcasūdani (Ceylonese edition), p. 463: Tattha Nando 'ti tassa nāmaṁ, Vaccho'ti gottaṁ; Kiso'ti tassa nāmaṁ, Saṁkicco'ti gottaṁ.

chief pupils of a renowned Brāhman hermit and teacher named Sarabhaṅga.[1] The hermit, known as Jotipāla to his parents, is addressed in one of the Jātaka verses by his family name as Koṇḍañña (Sk. Kauṇḍinya[2]). His hermitage was built on the banks of Godhāvarī, in the Kaviṭṭha forest. Seeing that his hermitage became crowded, and there was no room for the multitude of ascetics to dwell there he ordered most of his chief pupils to go elsewhere, taking with them many thousands of ascetics. But Kisa Vaccha was one of those who, following the instruction of their teacher, went away alone. He came to live in the city of Kumbhavatī, in the dominion of King Daṇḍakī. It is related in the Jātaka that this king having sinned against Kisa Vaccha, the guileless hermit, was destroyed with his realm, excluding its three subordinate kingdoms, of which the Kings Kāliṅga, Aṭṭhaka and Bhīmaratha were among the lay followers of Sarabhaṅga.[3] The Jātaka literature of the Buddhists also preserves a brief account of another Brāhman hermit called Saṁkicca, who like Sarabhaṅga is honoured as a Bodhisatta.[4] It is to be judged from Saṁkicca's allusion to Kisa Vaccha's humiliation in the past that he was a successor of the latter.[5] But neither Kisa Vaccha nor Saṁkicca is represented in the Jātaka as a leader of the Ājīvika sect. Further, in view of the discrepancy that exists between the two names, by no stretch of imagination can Kisa Vaccha be transformed into Nanda Vaccha. The same difficulty arises in connection with the two names Saṁkicca and Kisa Saṁkicca, since the epithet Kisa (lean), applied to the second name, was apparently meant to

[1] Jātaka No. 522.

[2] Fausböll's Jātaka, V, p. 140.

[3] Fausböll's Jātaka, V, p. 135.

[4] *Ibid*, V, p. 151; V, p. 277.

[5] *Ibid*, V, p. 267.

distinguish the Ājīvika leader from all his namesakes, Saṁkicca and the rest. In point of fact, then, there is no other ground to justify the identification of Kisa Vaccha with Nanda Vaccha, or of Saṁkicca with Kisa Saṁkicca, than the fact that the views of Sarabhaṅga, the teacher of Kisa Vaccha, bear *a priori*, like those of the hermit Saṁkicca, a close resemblance to the ethical teaching of Makkhali Gosāla at whose hands the Ājīvika religion attained a philosophical character. Without being dogmatic on such a disputable point as this, I cannot but strongly feel that all possible enquiries concerning Nanda Vaccha and Kisa Saṁkicca are sure to lead the historian back to a typical representative of the Vānaprastha or Vaikhānasa order of Indian hermits, such as Sarabhaṅga. The same, I believe, will be the inevitable result, if we enquire into the Jaina history of Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta. The 15th section of the 5th Jaina Aṅga, commonly known as the Bhagavatī Sūtra, contains a quaint story of six past reanimations of Gosāla, consummated by his present reanimation as Maṅkhaliputta.[1] It is stated that Gosāla in his first human existence was born as Udāi Kuṇḍiyāyaṇa who left his home early in youth for religious life, and that after having acquired Saṁkhāṇaṁ (higher knowledge), he underwent the seven changes of body by means of reanimation. The seven reanimations were undergone successively by Gosāla since his Udāi-birth in the bodies of

(1) Eṇejjaga (Sk. Ṛiṇañjaya), outside Rāyagiha, for 21 years;

(2) Mallarāma, outside Uddaṇḍapura, for 21 years;

(3) Maṇḍiya, outside Campā, for 20 years;

(4) Roha, outside Vāṇārasi, for 19 years;

---

[1] See extracts from the Bhagavatī in Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, Appendix II, p. 252.

(5) Bhāraddāi (Sk. Bhāradvāja), outside Ālabhiyā, for 18 years;

(6) Ajjuṇa Gomāyuputta, outside Vesāli, for 17 years;

(7) Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta, at Sāvatthi in Hālāhalā's pottery bazar, for 16 years.

One need not be surprised if in this fanciful enumeration and chronology of the seven reanimations undergone by Gosāla since his Udāi-birth during a period of 117 years there is preserved a genealogical succession of seven Ājīvika leaders, together with a list of such successive geographical centres of their activities as Rāyagiha, Uddaṇḍapura, Campā, Vāṇārasi, Ālabhiyā, Vesāli and Sāvatthi. This is at any rate the only legitimate inference to be drawn from the manner in which Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta is made to enumerate and describe his reanimations in the Bhagavatī. It is not difficult to ascertain that Gosāla used the word 'reanimation' rather figuratively, in a secondary sense. He did not mean thereby that one teacher having died, was reborn as another, but that one leader having passed away, the spirit of his teaching was continued in a reanimated or rejuvenated form in the teaching of his successor. Let me cite a passage from Professor Leumann's translation of the extracts from the Bhagavatī, Section XV, in illustration of the point at issue. Gosāla is represented, in the 16th year of his career as an Ājīvika teacher, as declaring:

"With the seventh change, I left in Sāvatthi in Hālāhalā's pottery bazar the body of Ajjuṇaga and entered that of Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta for the space of 16 years."[1] Here by the 'space of 16 years' he referred, as is evident from his history in the Bhagavatī, only to

---

[1] Leumann's Extracts from the Bhagavatī, XV. See Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, Appendix II, p. 254.

the interval of time reckoned from the year of his succession as an Ājīvika leader, and certainly not to the period which had elapsed since his real birth-day. This suspicion is forced upon us as we remember that Sāvatthi, where he is said to have been reanimated in his seventh change, is the very city where he became first recognised as a teacher (Jina), and found shelter in the premises of a rich potter woman named Hālāhalā.[1]

The Bhagavatī account does not mention the place where Udāi Kuṇḍiyāyaṇa (Sk. Udāyi Kauṇḍinya) lived, nor does it state the reason why the Udāi-birth was not counted among the past reanimations of Gosāla. But it is clearly stated that Udāi, too, was a homeless recluse who had obtained higher knowledge. Can we not reasonably suppose, even in the midst of such uncertainty, that Udāi Kuṇḍiyāyaṇa of the Jaina Sūtra was, like Sarabhaṅga Koṇḍañña of the Buddhist Jātaka, just a typical representative of an ancient religious order of the hermits? Are we not justified in presuming that the Ājīvika sect sprang originally from a Vānaprastha or Vaikhānasa order of the hermits and gained an independent foothold as the result of its gradual differentiation from the parent āśrama? I would say yes, because accepting this as a working hypothesis the historian can well explain why the Ājīvikas representing as they did a religious order of wandering mendicants, antagonistic in many ways to the religion of Brāhmans and Hermits, should and did retain some clear traces of the austere mode of discipline followed generally by the hermits in the wood, austere enough to be classed promiscuously in certain Buddhist passages[2] with the practices of the Vānaprastha order. The Bhagavatī account of

[1] Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, Appendix II, p. 252. *Cf.* Hoernle's translation of the Uvāsagadasāo, Appendix I, p. 4.

[2] Aṅguttara, Part I, p. 295.

the past reanimations of Gosāla, quaint and fanciful though it is, enables the historian to carry back the history of the Ājīvikas for 117 years counted backwards from Gosāla, and to suppose that a new Bhikṣu order, having kinship with the Jainas and the Buddhists, completely differentiated itself, within a century or more, from a Vānaprastha order from which it arose. It is, at all events, certain that the Ājīvikas had a history before Gosāla, and whether that history commenced with Nanda Vaccha or with Eṇejjaga, both the Buddhist and Jaina records lead us back to a Sarabhaṅga Koṇḍañña or to a Udāi Kuṇḍiyāyaṇa who might be regarded as a distinguished representative of the ancient hermits. To deny this, I am afraid to say, will be just to record the names of a few predecessors of Gosāla, a procedure hitherto followed by the Indianists, *e.g.*, Professor D. R. Bhandarkar and Dr. Hoernle. I have to premise, therefore, that the pre-Makkhali history of the Ājīvikas is the history of a formative period during which they brought about a radical change in the religious life of ancient India by the modification of certain rules and views of the hermits and by the gradual differentiation of their standpoint from that of others.

2. Makkhali Period.

The central figure in the history of the Ājīvikas is Makkhali Gosāla whose teaching served to supply a philosophic basis to Ājīvika religion. His career as a recluse covers, according to his history in the Bhagavatī, a short period of 24 years, of which the first six were profitably spent in Paṇiyabhūmi, in the company of Mahavīra whom he had met for the first time, in Nālaṁdā near Rāyagiha. After a close association for six years the two ascetics separated in Siddhatthagāma on account of a doctrinal difference that arose between them, and

never met afterwards but once in Sāvatthi shortly before the ignominious death of Gosāla, which took place 16 years before the Nirvāṇa of Mahāvīra. The bone of contention was a theory of reanimation which Gosāla formulated from his observation of periodical reanimations of plant-life, and generalised it to such an extent as to apply it indiscriminately to all forms of life.[1] 'Gosāla for his part, after the separation, went to Sāvatthi, where in Hālāhalā's potter-shop after a six months' course of severe asceticism, he attained Jinahood.' There he became the leader of a sect, called the Ājīviya. In the 24th year of his mendicancy he was visited by six Disācaras or Wanderers with whom he discussed their respective theories. These Disācarās, convinced by his theory of 'the change through reanimation' (bauṭṭa-parihāra), placed themselves under his guidance. It is stated in the Bhagavatī that Gosāla had a severe attack of fever a few weeks before his death and that his words and actions in a state of delirium gave rise to some new tenets and practices of the Ājīviyas, notably the doctrine of eight finalities (aṭṭha caramāiṁ) and the use of four things as drinks and four substitutes. In spite of his last instruction that his body should be disposed of with every mark of dishonour, his disciples 'gave his body a public burial with all honours according to his original instructions.' His death was coincident with an important political event, namely, the war between King Kuṇiya of Aṁga and King Ceḍaga of Vesāli.

There is indication in the Bhagavatī account of Gosāla that he viewed the grotesque practices of the Brāhman ascetics with contempt. It is related, for instance, that at the sight of the ascetic Vesiyāyaṇa 'sitting with up-raised arms and upturned face in the glare of the sun, while his body was swarming with lice,' he quietly dropped behind, and derisively enquired of the ascetic

[1] "Evaṁ khalu savvajīvâvi paritṭaparihāraṁ pariharaṁti."

whether he was a sage or a bed of lice. His conduct provoked the Brāhman ascetic so much that he attempted to strike Gosāla with his magic power. This unpleasant incident happened while Mahāvīra and Gosāla were travelling together, a few months before their separation, from the town Siddhatthagāma to Kummagāma and back.[1]

With regard to his early years, it is related in the Bhagavatī that he was born in the settlement Saravaṇa, in the vicinity apparently of the city of Sāvatthi. He came of low parentage. His father was a Maṅkhali, *i.e.*, a mendicant who earned his livelihood by showing a picture which he carried in his hand. Once on his wanderings Maṅkhali came to Saravaṇa and failing to obtain any other shelter, he took refuge for the rainy season in the cowshed (Gosālā) of a wealthy Brāhman Gobahula, where his wife Bhaddā brought forth a son who became famous as Gosāla Maṅkhaliputta. When grown up, he adopted the profession of his father, that is, of a Maṅkhali. In his wanderings, Gosāla happened to meet the young ascetic Mahāvīra in Nālaṁdā, near Rāyagiha, and observing that the latter, although yet a mere learner, was received with great honour by a rich householder of Rāyagiha, he approached Mahāvīra with the request to accept him as a disciple.

It goes without saying that quaint humour and bitter irony runs through the Bhagavatī-account of Maṅkhaliputta Gosāla. There is an attempt throughout, a conscious effort on the part of the Jaina author, to represent the greatest Ājīvika teacher as a person of most contemptible character, a man of low parentage, of low profession, who was induced to adopt the ascetic life by a prospect of material gain, an apostate disciple of Mahāvīra, of a more heinous character than another disciple, Jamāli, the son-in-law of Mahāvīra. He is represented as an

[1] Hoernle's translation of the Uvāsagadasāo, Appendix I, p. 3.

ungrateful wretch who deserted the company of his teacher on account of a doctrinal difference, and shamelessly declared himself to be a Jina, denying his deep indebtedness to his teacher. Even as a teacher and leader of the Ājīvika sect, he is said to have taught all false doctrines and erroneous views which did more harm than good to mankind. He is made to appear as a craze before his death in his words and actions, and confess his shame even to his own followers. But complete and full of historical truth though it is, the Bhagavatī account must be considered as production of a later self-conscious age, and cannot therefore be accepted *en bloc.* As a canonical commentary (Viyāhapaṇṇatti, Vyākhyā-prajñapti), the Bhagavatī-sūtra must be taken as later in point of date than some of the Aṅgas, *e.g.*, Āyāraṁga, Sūyagaḍaṁga and Uvāsagadasāo, which are wanting in detail about the personal history of Gosāla, and where the account of his views is more sober.

The historian is apt to commit a great mistake and do injustice to Gosāla, if he accepts without proper examination the Jaina account in the Bhagavatī as a piece of genuine historical record. In view of other records coming from the Buddhists and the Brāhmans which contradict in many points the statements in the Bhagavatī, no implicit reliance can surely be placed on all that the Jaina would have us believe. On closely examining the literature of the Buddhists, we notice that in all the later accounts there is a similar conscious attempt to reconstruct the early history of Gosāla in such a manner as to make him appear as a person of low parentage and vicious character. In these respects the later Jaina and Buddhist traditions agree. For instance, Buddhaghosa in his commentaries, speaks of Gosāla as a servant in the household of a rich man, who walking on a muddy piece of ground, with an

oil-pot in his hand, stumbled from carelessness and began to run away through the fear of his master. The latter ran up and caught the edge of his garment, and he letting go his cloth, fled away naked (acelako hutvā).[1]

I leave it to the sober critic to judge if the above story of Gosāla was not a fiction invented by the Buddhist commentator in order to account for the fact that Makkhali was a naked ascetic as all the Ājīvikas were. Buddhaghosa agrees with the Jaina historian in the Bhagavatī in relating that Makkhali came to be called Gosāla from the circumstance of his being born in a cowshed, although he does not expressly mention, like the Jaina, that the name was given by his parents. But the Buddhist commentator differs entirely from the Jaina with regard to the etymology of the name Makkhali, just as Pāṇini, the most celebrated Sanskrit grammarian, differed in this respect from the Jainas and Buddhists as well as from his own commentators. While the Jaina compiler of the Bhagavatī derived the name Maṅkhali from Maṅkha, *i.e.*, a picture carried by a mendicant in his hand (or better, as Dr. Hoernle suggests, the picture of a deity which a beggar carried about him and tried to extract alms from the charitable by showing it, just as in the present day in Bengal such beggars usually carry crude pictures or representations of Śītalā or Olābibi, and in Puri they carry pictures of Jagannāth), the Buddhist commentator Buddhaghosa had recourse to a more fanciful etymology, *viz.*, that the name Makkhali was derived from the warning of his employer expressed in the words "Tāta, mā khalîti," *i.e.*, "My dear man, take care lest you stumble!"[2]

[1] Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī, I, p. 144.

[2] Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī, I, p. 144. See Hoernle's Translation of the Uvāsagadasāo, App. II, p. 29; Spence Hardy's Manual of Buddhism, p. 301. *Cf.* Manorathapūraṇi, the commentary on the Aṅguttaranikāya (Ceylonese edition), p. 287. Makkhalîti mā khalîti vacanam upādāya evaṁ laddhanāmo titthakaro.

Against these ingenious etymologies of Maṅkhali and Makkhali, we obtain from Pāṇini an important sūtra setting forth the real import of Maskariṇa, the Sanskrit form of the name. Pāṇini in the sūtra VI. 1. 154, describes the Maskariṇas as a class of wanderers who carried a *maskara* or bamboo staff about them.

"Maskara-maskariṇo veṇu-parivrājakayoḥ."

On the other hand, Patañjali in his comments on the above sūtra of Pāṇini, suggests that the Maskariṇa was called Maskariṇa not so much because this class of wanderers carried about them a maskara or bamboo staff as because they taught "Mā kṛita karmāṇi, mā kṛita karmāṇi, etc.,"—"Don't perform actions, don't perform actions; quietism (alone) is desirable to you."[1]

The later glosses on the same sūtra in Kaiyaṭa's Pradīpa and the Kāśika-vṛitti do not merit any further consideration, as these are based upon the authority of Patañjali's Mahābhāṣya, and all point to the fact that the maskariṇas denied the efficacy of action.[2]

With regard to the relation of Makkhali with Mahāvīra, the Buddhist records differ from the Jaina which seeks to represent the former as an apostate disciple of the latter, who became separated from his teacher after a close association for six years spent in Paṇiyabhūmi. This account of Makkhali in the Bhagavatī is contradicted by certain statements met with in the same sūtra and elsewhere.[3] First, in the Bhagavatī itself it is stated that Gosāla became recognised as a Jina and a leader of the Ajīviyas two years before Mahāvīra's Jinahood, and

---

[1] Bhandarkar's 'Ajivikas,' Indian Antiquary, Vol. XLI, 1912, p. 289; Hoernle's 'Ajivikas,' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics. Patañjali says, "maskaro' syāstîti maskarī parivrājakaḥ. Kiṁ tarhi mā kṛita karmāṇi mā kṛita karmāṇi śāntirvaḥ śreyasîtyâhāto maskarī parivrājakaḥ."

[2] See the quotations in Bhandarkar's 'Ajivikas,' Ind. Ant., Vol. XLI, 1912, p. 270.

[3] The point is discussed in Hoernle's Translation of the Uvāsagadasāo, p. 111, f. n. 255.

that he predeceased the latter by sixteen years. Secondly, the Kalpasūtra relates that Mahāvīra lived one year in Paṇiyabhūmi and six years in Mithilā.

Both the Jaina and Buddhist records agree in speaking of Gosāla as a leader of the Ājīvika sect and the powerful exponent of the Ājīvika system. They also agree in calling the Ājīvikas naked ascetics (acelakas), in differentiating their rules of life from those of the hermits of the Vānaprastha order,[1] in magnifying their uncleanliness, in emphasizing their corruption of morals, in imputing a secular motive to their religious life, and in mercilessly criticising their fatalistic creed. In both the records, Sāvatthi is mentioned as the Ājīvika headquarters.[2] In some of the Buddhist passages we meet with the form Ājīvaka, and the term in either form is explained as meaning a mendicant worse than a person with household ties.[3] In a Dialogue of the Jaina Sūtra Kṛitâṅga, Ārdraka, a Jaina teacher, openly accuses Gosāla of sexual immorality.[4] The Mahāsaccaka sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya preserves a Dialogue where Saccaka, the Jaina, in reply to Buddha's question whether Ājīvikas or the followers of Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṁkicca and Makkhali Gosāla, practised the most austere mode of bodily discipline, says that they indulged in all sorts of sensual pleasures.[5] The Buddhist literature contains a love story

---

[1] The rules of the Ājīviyas, set forth in the Aupapātika Sūtra (Leumann's edition, p. 80, sec. 120), are the same as those stated in the Majjhima Nikāya, I, p. 318, and in the Dīgha, I, p. 165, sec. 14.

Again, the rules of the Vānaprastha hermits, described in the above Jaina Upāṅga, p. 68, sec. 74, are similar to those stated in the Dīgha, I, p. 166, sec. 14.

[2] That the Ājīvikas were naked ascetics and that Sāvatthi was their head quarters are clear from two episodes in the Vinaya Mahāvagga VI. 2 ; VIII. 15. *Cf.* Ind. Ant., Vol. XLI (1912), p. 288.

[3] Majjhima Nikāya, I, p. 483.

[4] Sūtra Kṛitâṅga (ed. Dhanapati), II. 6. *Cf.* Jaina-Sūtras, Pt. II, p. 411 : "those who use cold water, eat seeds, accept things especially prepared for them, and have intercourse with women, are (no better than) householders, but they are no Śramaṇas."

[5] Majjhima, I, p. 238.

of an Ājīvika named Upaka, who married Cāpā, the fowler's daughter; and Upaka describes himself as having been a *laṭṭhihattha*, *i.e.*, a wandering mendicant with a staff in hand. I have reason to believe that in the Buddhist stories of Ciñcā[1] and Sundarī[2] an evidence is lurking of the immorality and lack of principle of the Ājīvikas, who did not scruple to get the Buddha into trouble by spreading damaging rumours about his character and getting up a murder case through the instrumentality of those two of their womenfolk. Although the stories declare indefinitely that all the heretics were allied in this conspiracy, it is difficult to conceive that such an alliance was possible because of the fact that Sāvatthi, where the scene is laid, was predominantly the headquarters of the Ājīvikas, and that the Ājīvikas were in conflict with other heretical sects. But it can be imagined that both Ciñcā[3] and Sundarī[4] either belonged to the Ājīvika order, or had, at any rate, very intimate connection with it. Suffice it to say that we have positive statement from the Buddhist literature[5] that the Ājīvika community, like the Jaina or the Buddhist, consisted of recluses and householders, both male and female. It is clear that the corruption of their morals which the Buddhists and the Jainas insinuate and exaggerate, is not without foundation, and that some individual cases of moral transgression have only been generalised by their opponents and applied to the whole sect. For it is difficult to imagine that if the Ājīvikas were as a body so viciously immoral and encroached on the decency of the civic society, they could retain, as they did, an important position among the

[1] Jātaka, I, pp. 280, 437, 440; II, pp. 121, 160; III, p. 298; IV, p. 187 f.

[2] Jātaka, II, p. 415 f.; Dhammapada-Comy. on Verse 306.

[3] She is described in the Jātaka, I, p. 280, as a female wandering ascetic in Sāvatthi (paribbājikā Sāvatthiyaṁ).

[4] Sundarī, too, is described similarly, *e.g.*, in the Jātaka, II, p. 415.

[5] *E. g.*, Aṅguttara, Pt. III, p. 304.

rival sects. On the other hand, taking a man as man, and a woman as woman, we can well understand how such states of things came to be among the Ājīvikas, as among all the Orders, the Jaina or the Buddhist, the Śaiva or the Śākta, the Vaiṣṇava or the Christian. The Uvāsagadasāo and the Bhagavatī Sūtra make mention of a few rich lay disciples of Gosāla belonging to the Vaiśya class, *e.g.*, potters and bankers, such as Kuṇḍakuliya, a citizen of Kampillapura, a banker [1]; Saddālaputta, a rich potter of Polāsapura [2]; Hālāhalā, in whose potter-shop in Sāvatthi Gosāla found shelter and spent the greater part of his ascetic-life [3]; and Ayaṁpula, a citizen of Sāvatthi.[4] The Majjhima Nikāya mentions a coach-builder who belonged to the Ājīvika sect.[5] According to the Dhammapada commentary Migāra, a banker of Sāvatthi was a lay follower of the Ājīvikas.[6]

That the Ajīvika community consisted of recluses and householders, both male and female, is well borne out by the Buddhist version of Makkhali's doctrine of chaḷâbhijātiyo—division of mankind into six *abhijātis* or mental types. Gosāla is said to have placed the Ājīvika householders [7] in the *Yellow class*, the Ājīvika mendicants and the Ājīvakinis in the *White class*, and the three Ajīvika leaders including himself in the *Supremely White class*.[8]

---

[1] Uvāsagadasāo (ed. Hoernle), Lecture VI.

[2] *Ibid*, Sec. VII.

[3] Leumann's Extracts from the Bhagavatī, XV. See Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, Appendix II, p. 252. Hoernle's translation of the Uvāsagadasāo, Appendix I, p. 4 ff.

[4] Hoernle's Appendix, *ibid*, p. 9.

[5] Majjhima Nikāya, I, p. 31.

[6] Dhammapada-Comy. on Verse 53.

[7] Lit. "the householders who wear white clothes and are the adherents (sāvakā) of the unclothed one (acelaka)." Hoernle's Appendix II, *ibid*, p. 22.

[8] Aṅguttara Nikāya, part III, p. 384: "haliddâbhijāti paññattā: gihi odātavasanā acelakasāvakā......sukkâbhijāti paññattā ājīvakā ājīvakiniyo......paramā sukkâbhijāti paññattā: Nando Vaccho, Kiso Saṁkicco, Makkhali Gosāla." Note that the doctrine is wrongly attributed to Pūraṇa Kassapa. *Cf.* Dīgha Nikāya I, p. 53; Sumaṅgala Vilāsinī, I, p. 162, where the doctrine is attributed to Makkhali Gosāla.

In the Buddhist texts,[1] Makkhali Gosāla and other five heretical teachers, Pūraṇa Kassapa, Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta (Mahāvīra) and the rest, are spoken of in the same terms as "the head of an order, of a following, the teacher of a school, well known and of repute, as a sophist, revered by the people, a man of experience, who has long been a recluse, old and well-stricken in years."[2] In the canonical Jātaka Book,[3] the Heretics are compared in a body to a crow, stripped of its gain and fame after the appearance of the crested and sweet-voiced peacock, while the commentator, who identifies the crow of the Jātaka story with Nigaṇṭha Nāthaputta [4] compares the Heretics with the fire-flies whose faint light faded before the rising glory of the sun, *i.e.*, the Buddha.[5] Similarly, the Divyâvadāna contains a curious story of two magic-fights in each of which the Buddha overwhelmed the six Heretics by his superior *Riddhi*, once in Rājagriha and the second time in Śrāvastī.[6] There are again canonical Discourses where the Samaṇa Gotama is described as a younger contemporary of the six Titthakaras, both younger by birth and junior by renunciation.[7] This receives confirmation from the Jaina tradition, recorded in the Bhagavatī, that Gosāla predeceased Mahāvīra by 16 years,[8] and from the Buddhist tradition, recorded in the Sāmagāma and

---

[1] Dīgha Nikāya, I, pp. 47-49: "Saṁghī c'eva gaṇī ca gaṇâcariyo ca ñāto yasassī titthakaro sādhu sammato bahu-janassa rattaññū cira-pabbajito addhagato vayo anuppatto." *Cf.* Sutta Nipāta, III, No. 6, p. 91; Milindapañho, p. 4.

[2] Dialogues of the Buddha, II, p. 66.

[3] See Bāvern Jātaka in Fausböll's Jātaka, No. 339, Vol. III, p. 128.

[4] Fausböll's Jātaka, Vol. III, p. 128: Tadā kāko Nigaṇṭho Nāthaputto.

[5] *Ibid*, p. 126: Titthiyā hi anuppanne Buddhe lābhino ahesuṁ, uppanne pana hatalābhaskkārā suriyûggamane khajjopanakâ viya jātā.

[6] Divyâvadāna, p. 143 foll. The Heretics are named Pūraṇaḥ Kāśyapo, Maskarī Gośālīputraḥ, Saṁjayī Vairaṭṭīputraḥ, Ajitaḥ Keśakambalaḥ, Kakudaḥ Kātyāyano, Nirganthaḥ Jñātiputraḥ.

[7] Sutta Nipāta, p. 91; Samaṇo hi Gotamo daharo c'eva jātiyā, navo ca pabbajjāya. *Cf.* Saṁyutta, I, 70.

[8] See *ante*, p. 13.

such other Suttas, that Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta, *i.e.*, Mahāvīra, predeceased the Buddha by a few years,[1] the decease of the former at Pāvā having been followed by a schism dividing his disciples, the Nigaṇṭhas, into two rival parties.[2] The Milindapañho on the other hand, represents the six Heretics as if they were all contemporaries of King Milinda, identified by Dr. Rhys Davids with the Greco-Bactrian ruler Menander, who reigned, according to the Buddhist tradition, five centuries after the Buddha's Parinibbāna.[3] But remembering that they are described in an older canonical discourse, *viz.*, the Sāmaññaphala Sutta, exactly in the same way as the contemporaries of Ajātasattu, King of Magadha, I have reason to suspect that the Milinda-story grew out of literary plagiarism involving an anachronism, which can by no means be either explained away or harmonized with the earlier and more authentic chronology furnished by the Jaina and Buddhist texts. The Milinda account of six Heretics must accordingly be rejected as spurious and false. The deep mystery which hangs like mist over the relation of Makkbali with Mahāvīra cannot fully be unravelled in this introduction, the express purpose of which is to present, on a traditional basis, an outline of the history of the Ājīvikas. Suffice it to say, that the evidences derived from either the Jaina or the Buddhist sources of information, do not bear out the Jaina pious belief that Gosāla was one of the two false disciples of Mahāvīra, and tend rather to prove the contrary. I mean that if the historian be called upon to pronounce a definite opinion on this disputed question he cannot but say that

---

[1] Majjhima Nikāya, II, p. 143: Ekaṁ samayaṁ Bhagavā Sakkesu viharati Sāmagāme. Tena kho pana samayena Nigaṇṭho Nātaputto Pāvāyaṁ adhunā kālakato hoti. Tassa Kālakiriyāya bhinnā Nigaṇṭhā dvedhikajātā bhaṇḍanajātā kalahajātā vivādâpannā aññamaññaṁ mukhasattîhi vitudantā viharanti.

[2] Trenckner's Milinda, p. 4 foll.

[3] Dīgha Nikāya, I, p. 47 foll.

indebtedness, if any, was more on the side of the teacher than on that of one who is branded by the Jaina as a false disciple. And the critic, before judging one way or the other, shall do well to consider the following points :—

1. That the priority of Gosāla regarding Jinahood before Mahāvīra can be established beyond doubt by the history of Maṅkhaliputta in the Bhagavatī, confirmed in some important respects by the history of Mahāvīra in the Kalpa Sūtra.

It is expressly stated in the Kalpa Sūtra that out of the 72 years of Mahāvīra's life, he lived 30 years as householder, and spent 42 years as recluse, *viz.*, 12 as a learner (Sekha) and 30 as a Jina or Kevalin. Again out of the 12 years of his Sekhahood, he spent upwards of one year as a clothed mendicant, while in the second year he became a naked ascetic.[1] That is to say, he spent the first year as a member of the religious order of Pārśvanātha, whose followers, called Nirgranthas, used to wear clothes, but in the second year he left that order and joined the Ājīvikas. "The latter year," as Dr. Hoernle specifies, "coincides with that in which Mahāvīra, according to the Bhagavatī, met Gosāla and attracted him as his (apparently, first) disciple."[2] Of the remaining ten years, he spent six in association with Gosāla. If out of the 24 years of his ascetic life, Gosāla spent 8 years as a learner and 16 as a Jina, it follows that after their separation, Mahāvīra had to wait four years longer before his Jinahood, while Gosāla attained this exalted state within two years from the date of separation. Dr. Hoernle admits that this priority of Gosāla in regard to Jinahood, before Mahāvīra is a noteworthy point.'[3] But here I

[1] Jacobi's Kalpa-Sūtra, Sec. 117.

[2] Hoernle's translation of the Uvāsagadasāo, p. 110, f.n. 253.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 111, f.n. 253.

would ask, is it the right conclusion to be drawn from this, as Dr. Hoernle has done, that Gosāla was originally a disciple of Mahāvīra, a fact which, according to him, 'naturally enough explains the intense hostility towards him, of Mahāvīra, who resented the presumption of a disciple in taking precedence of his master?'[1] How can it be imagined that Mahāvīra received Gosāla as a disciple at a time when he himself was a mere learner? Are not a learner and a teacher in his case a contradiction in terms? And can we not reasonably understand that neither Gosāla nor Mahāvīra was technically a disciple or a teacher, but two intelligent members of the same religious order, two disciples of a common teacher, and two comrades under the guidance of an Ājīviya leader?

It is clear from the Bhagavatī story of the seven reanimations of Gosāla that Ajjuṇa was the Ājīviya leader before their separation, and that Gosāla succeeded him two years after his separation from Mahāvīra. The general history of Mahāvīra, so far as it can be gathered from the Jaina literature, goes to show that he attained Jinahood four years after his separation from Gosāla, when he founded a new Nirgrantha order with which the old order of Pārśvanātha was amalgamated afterwards, through the intercession of Keśī and Gautama into a common Jaina school of religio-philosophy.[2] The Bhagavatī account does not precisely state what sort of relation Gosāla had with the Ājīviyas before his separation from Mahāvīra, but it will certainly be going too far away from the historical truth to suppose that he had no connexion whatever with them until after he was separated from the latter. Apart from this, there are a few other facts which go to disprove the Jaina tradition. These are—

---

[1] Hoernle's translation of the Uvāsagadasāo, p. 111, f.n.

[2] Uttarâdhyayana, Lec. XXIII.

2. That in the Jaina and Buddhist fragments on the Ājīvika views and religious observances there are preserved certain terms and phrases of Gosāla which are neither Ardha-Māgadhi nor Pāli, but represent at once some older vehicle of expression or literary medium, more closely allied, as will be shown later, to the Dialect, *i.e.*, earlier than the more literary forms of Māgadhi Prākrits, *i.e.*, the languages of the Nigaṇṭhas and Sakyaputtiya samaṇas.

3. That the Bhagavatī account of Gosāla goes to prove that he was conversant with the Ājīviya literature consisting of eight Mahānimittas and two Maggas, the former of which probably formed, as Professor Leumann conjectures, part of the original Jaina canon, though no trace of them can be found in the existing one [1]

4. That both the Jaina and Buddhist interpretation and criticism of Gosāla's views and practices indicate that they belonged to an earlier stage of religious evolution, older at least than the Jaina or the Buddhist system where the Ājīvika creed is sharply criticized and considerably modified and improved.

5. That the intense hostility of Mahāvīra towards Gosāla cannot reasonably be brought forward as a proof of the latter's discipleship and insincerity, since there is a strong evidence to prove that the Buddha, though neither a teacher nor a disciple of Gosāla, openly denounced him as the greatest enemy of mankind [2] and considered his to be the worst of all heresies, like unto a piece of hair-garment which is cold in cold weather and hot in the heat.[3]

---

[1] Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, Appendix II, p. 249, f. n. 1.

[2] Aṅguttara Nikāya, Part 1, p. 33: Nâhaṁ bhikkhave aññam ekapuggalam pi samanupassāmi yo evaṁ bahujanahitâya paṭipanno bahujanâsukhāya bahūno janassa anatthāya ahitāya dukkhāya devamanussānaṁ yathayîdaṁ bhikkhave Makkhali Moghapuriso. *Cf. ibid*, p. 287.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 286: Seyyathâpi bhikkhave yāni kānici tantavutānaṁ vatthānaṁ kesakambalo tesaṁ paṭikittho akkhāyati. Kesakambalo bhikkhave sīte sīto uṇhe uṇho dubbaṇṇo duggandho dukkhasamphasso, evam eva kho bhikkhave yāni kānici puthu samaṇappavādānaṁ Makkhali-vādo tesaṁ paṭikittho akkhāyati.

6. And lastly, that the hostile attitude of Mahāvīra towards Gosāla ought, as in such other historical instances as those of Buddha and Mahāvīra, Aristotle and Plato, Rāmānuja and Śaṅkara, or of Kant and Hume, to be viewed as a positive proof of priority, the logical priority at least, of the latter whose views are sharply criticised by the former, leaving out of the question, in this particular instance, whether the thinker so criticised was a younger or an elder contemporary of the critic himself.

After a careful consideration of these points along with the main theses of Gosāla's philosophy, I am tempted to hold with Prof. Hermann Jacobi, that "the greatest influence on the development of Mahāvīra's doctrine, must.........be ascribed to Gosāla, the son of Makkhali," and that "we have no reason to doubt the statement of the Jaina, that Mahāvīra and Gosāla for some time practised austerities together; but the relation between them probably was different from what the Jainas would have us believe."[1] I am tempted, in other words, to believe that Gosāla represents, as a teacher at least, an earlier stage of thought-evolution and religious discipline, earlier at any rate than the period covered by the early history of Jainism and Buddhism as expounded by Mahāvīra and Gotama. Gosāla must be ranked among the five heretical teachers who together with Nigaṇṭha Nātaputta (Mahāvīra) are distinguished as six titthiyas from the Brāhman wanderers on the one hand, and from the Brāhman hermits and legislators on the other. They are distinguished as a class of recluses and sophists who differed from the Brāhmans in character, intelligence, earnestness, purpose and method. An analysis of Gosāla's tenets goes to prove that he belonged as a thinker to the sophistic age when biological consideration and animistic belief were

---

[1] Jaina Sūtras, Pt. II, Introd., p. xxix.

predominant in the realm of religious thought and metaphysical speculation. The creative genius of the older Upaniṣad period, the period of the Āraṇyakas and the Brāhmana Upaniṣads, was followed by a new spirit of free-thinking and sophism under the influence of which the intuitional philosophy of the Upaniṣad itself became sectarian at the hands of the Brāhman wanderers, a chaotic state of conflicting ideas and religious sentiments when philosophy failed to provide a correct and comprehensive view of the universe, and a sound and rational theory of life, acting as an unfailing guide to human conduct and affording a general standard for the determination of ethical values. In this respect the Dogmatists, the Sceptics and the Moralists are put by the Jainas and the Buddhists, with certain reservations, in the category of Akriyāvādins—the upholders of the doctrine of non-action. It also may be inferred from the Jaina or the Buddhist description of these three classes of thinkers that they all agreed in recognising in diverse ways that quietism was after all the *summum bonum* of spiritual life.

Now, in the absence of any records from Gosāla himself or from his followers, it is an extremely difficult task to endeavour with success to render a complete and faithful account of Gosāla's views and practices. A few isolated fragments have survived, no doubt, in the existing literatures of the Jainas, the Buddhists and the Brāhmans, but these too are so much coloured by sectarian bias and so very contradictory in places that it is well nigh impossible to bring them all into a focus. Before any way can be made, evidences must be collected from all the possible sources of information, and the evidences thus collected must be sifted with the minutest care. Over and above this, a tremendous effort of imagination and genial intellectual sympathy are essential at

every step. So far as the sources of information are concerned, I may here remain content with mentioning the following :—

1. Jaina Sources—(*a*) Sūyāgaḍaṁga (I. 1.2.1-14; I. 1.4.7-9; II. 1.29; II. 6) with Śīlāṅka's Ṭīkā.

(*b*) Bhagavatī Sūtra (Saya XV, Uddesa I) with Abhayadeva's Commentary.

(*c*) Leumann's Das Aupapātika Sūtra (Secs. 118 and 120).

2. Buddhist Sources—(*a*) Sāmaññaphala Sutta (Dīgha I, pp. 53-54) with Buddhaghosa's commentary.

(*b*) Saṁyutta Nikāya, III, p. 69, ascribes the first portion of the Sāmaññaphala account of Gosāla's views, N'atthi hetu, n'atthi paccayo, etc., to Pūraṇa Kassapa.

(*c*) Aṅguttara Nikāya (Pt. I, p. 286) with the Manorathapūraṇi confounds Makkhali Gosāla apparently with Ajita Kesa-kambala.

(*d*) Aṅguttara Nikāya (Pt. III, pp. 383-84) with the Manoratha-Pūraṇi represents Kassapa as if he were a disciple of Makkhali Gosāla.

(*e*) Mahāsaccaka Sutta (Majjhima I, p. 231), *cf.* also I, p. 36.

(*f*) The Chinese and Tibetan versions of the Sāmaññaphala Sutta, translated in Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, where the doctrines of the six Heretics are hopelessly mixed up.

(*g*) Trenckner's Milinda-Pañho, p. 5.

(*h*) Mahābodhi-Jātaka (No. 528), *cf.* Āryaśūra's Jātaka-Mālā, XXIII.

Comparing these sources and noting their points of agreement and difference I may mention just a few characteristic features of Gosāla's philosophy :—

1. Gosāla was, to start with, the propounder of a 'doctrine of the change through re-animation' (*pauṭṭa-parihāravāda*),[1] or, better, of a theory of natural transformation (pariṇāmavāda),[2] which he came to formulate from the generalisation of the periodical re-animations of plant life. This is the central idea of his system according to the Bhagavatī account.

2. The basic idea of this theory as explained and illustrated in the Bhagavatī and in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta implies a process of natural and spiritual evolution through ceaseless rounds of births and deaths,[3] *i.e.*, *saṁsāra-suddhi*, as the doctrine is aptly summarised in the Majjhima[4] and in the Mahābodhi Jātaka.[5]

3. The *Pariṇāmavāda* seeks to explain the diversity of the organic world by these three principles—

(*a*) Fate (niyati=niyai)[6]

(*b*) Species (saṅgati=saṅgai[7]=pariyāya)[8]

(*c*) Nature (bhāva=sabhāva)[9]

" Niyati-saṅgati-bhāva-pariṇatā."[10]

---

[1] The term is so rendered by Prof. Leumann. See his translation of the extracts from the Bhagavatī, XV, in Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, Appendix II, p. 251.

[2] The term is implied in the adjective pariṇata, *cf.* the Dīgha 1, p. 53.

[3] Dīgha, I, p. 54: sandhāvitvā saṁsaritvā dukhass' antaṁ karissanti, *cf.* the Bhagavatī text quoted by Prof. Leumann (Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, App. II, p. 253, f. n. 3):—anupuvveṇaṁ khavaittā pacchā sijjhanti bujjhanti jāva antaṁ karenti.

[4] Majjhima, I, p. 31.

[5] Fausböll's Jātaka, V, p. 228.

[6] The Prākrit form of *niyati* occurs in the Sūyagadaṅga, I, 1.2.4.

[7, 8] The forms saṅgai and pariyāya are to be found in the Sūyagaḍaṅga, 1, 1.2.3; I, 1.4.8.

[9] According to Buddhaghosa's comment, bhāvo=sabhāvo, Sumaṅgalavilāsinī, I, p. 161.

[10] Dīgha, I, p. 53. Buddhaghosa explains *pariṇatā* as meaning diversified (nānāppakāraṁ pattā).

4. The organic world is characterised by six constant and opposed phenomena, *viz.*, gain and loss, pleasure and pain, life and death.

> " Savvesiṁ pāṇāṇaiṁ savvesiṁ bhūyāṇaiṁ
> Savvesiṁ jīvāṇaiṁ savvesiṁ sattāṇaiṁ
> imāiṁ saṇaikkamaṇiāiṁ vāgaraṇāiṁ
> vāgarai—taṁ lābhaṁ, alābhaṁ, suhaṁ
> dukhaṁ, jiveyaṁ, maraṇaṁ."[1]

5. The *Pariṇāmavāda* involves a conception of the infinity of time with the recurrent cycles of existence, and the same theory conveys a great message of hope by inculcating that even a dew-drop is so destined as to attain in course of natural evolution to the highest state of perfection in humanity.

6. The longest period or duration fixed for the evolution of life from the meanest thing on earth to the greatest in man covers 84 hundred thousand Mahākalpas.[2]

7. This necessitates a division of time into Mahākalpas, Kalpas, Antarakalpas and so forth, during which the universe of life progresses onward along the fixed path of evolution.[3]

8. The theory of progression itself necessitates the classification of the living substances on different methods, and groups them on a graduated scale in different types of existence which are considered as unalterably fixed.

9. The *Pariṇāmavāda* seeks to establish, even by its fatalistic creed, a moral government of law in the universe where nothing is dead, where nothing happens by chance, and where all that is and all that happens and is experienced are unalterably fixed as it were by a pre-determined law of nature.

---

[1] The passage is an extract from the Bhagavatī, Saya, XV, Uddesa I.

[2] Bhagavatī text quoted by Prof. Leumann. See Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, App. II, p. 253, f. n. 3; Dīgha, I, p. 54.

[3] Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, App. II, pp. 253-54; Dīgha, I, p. 54.

10. It teaches that as man is pre-destined in certain ways and as he stands highest in the gradations of existence, his freedom, to be worth the name, must be one within the operation of law, and that the duty of man as the highest of beings is to conduct himself according to law, and so to act and behave himself as not to trespass on the rights of others, to make the fullest use of one's liberties, to be considerate and discreet, to be pure in life, to abstain from killing living beings, to be free from earthly possessions, to reduce the necessaries of life to a minimum, and to strive for the best and highest, *i.e.*, Jinahood, which is within human powers.[1]

11. The fatalistic creed which is a logical outcome of *Pariṇāmavāda* confirms the popular Indian belief that action has its reward and retribution, and that heaven and hell are the inevitable consequences hereafter of merits and demerits of this life.

12. In accordance with the deterministic theory of Gosāla, man's life has to pass through eight developmental stages or periods (aṭṭhapurisabhūmiyo),[2] at each of which the physical growth proceeds side by side with the development of the senses and of mind with its moral and spiritual faculties[3]; and from this underlying theory of interaction of body and mind it follows that bodily discipline (kāya-bhāvanā)[4] is no less needed for purification of soul than mental (citta-bhāvanā).

13. The division of mankind, or, better, of living beings, into six main types (abhijātis) involves a conception of mind which is colourless by nature and falls into different types—*nīlakāya*, *pītakaya*, etc.—by the colouring of the different habits and actions, and hence the supreme

---

[1] Dīgha, I, p. 54; Aṅguttara, III, pp. 383-84; Majjhima, I, p. 238; Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 120.

[2] Dīgha, I, p. 54.

[3] Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī, I, pp. 162-163.

[4] Majjhima, I, p. 238.

spiritual effort of man consists in restoring mind to its original purity, *i.e.*, rendering it colourless or supremely white by purging it of all impurities that have stained it.[1]

By a glance at these features one can easily discern that Gosāla's philosophy was not entirely a new growth in the country, but one which bore a family likeness to the older and existing doctrines and theories in the midst of which it arose, with a new synthetic spirit seeking to weld together the higher metaphysics of the Upaniṣads and the civic and moral life of the Aryan people into one scheme of religious ethics. Considered in this light, a better understanding and fuller appreciation of the theoretic aspect of his philosophy and the practical side of his religion are impossible without a comparative study of the older theories and current beliefs which, as I expect to show in the following pages, constituted a natural environment for his own system. Accordingly, the history of Makkhali-period is to be conceived as a process of continued development of thought whereby the rigorous religious discipline and the simpler ethical doctrines of the pre-Makkhali teachers of the Ājīvikas were firmly established on a deeper scientific theory of evolution, side by side with and in the close environment of several conflicting theories and mutually contradictory dogmas, all interconnected in the organic development of Indian thought.

3. Post-Makhali Period.

Maṅkhaliputta Gosāla died, according to the Jaina evidence, at Hālāhalā's potter-shop in Sāvatthi, in the twenty-fourth year of his ascetic life (leaving behind him a glorious record of his career as a leader of the Ājīviyas and a teacher of philosophy). He had a severe attack of

[1] Dīgha, I, 53; Aṅguttara, III, pp. 383-84; Sumaṅgala-Vilāsinī, I, p. 162; Majjhima, I, p. 36.

typhoid fever of which he died, and died, as may be inferred from a prediction of Mahāvīra's, in seven days; and he predeceased, as it is implied in another prediction of Mahāvīra, the latter by sixteen years. His death (better Nirvāṇa) was coincident with an important political event, *viz.*, the war between Kūṇiya (Ajātasattu), formerly the Viceroy of Aṅga and then the King of Magadha after the usurpation of his father's throne, and Ceḍaga (Sk. Ceṭaka), the King (better, a powerful citizen)[1] of Vesāli. Some important details are preserved in the Bhagavatī of the suffering and intense pain that attended Gosāla's fever. The Jaina historian is fond of looking upon his fever with its attendant ailments as the dire consequence of a magic duel which he had so foolishly fought with Mahāvīra, his former teacher and then his superior rival. These details are important, as I presently expect to show, as having a far-reaching effect on the course of Ājīvika religion. The Bhagavatī account[2] mentions, among others, the following facts:—

(*a*) Visit of a company of six Disācaras or Vagabonds (better, Wanderers) to Sāvatthi—Sāṇa, Kalanda, Kaṇiyāra, Attheda, Aggivesāyaṇa and Ajjaṇa Gomāyuputta, with whom Gosāla discussed their respective theories in the twenty-fourth year of his asceticism.

(*b*) Acceptance of Gosāla's theory of re-animation by the Disācaras and their conversion to the Ājīviya faith.

(*c*) Extracts made by the Disācaras, according to their own ideas, from the ten canonical books, *viz.*, the eight *Mahānimittas* contained in the Puvvas and the two *Maggas*.

(*d*) Deduction of six principles, gain and loss, pleasure and pain, life and death, from the teaching of the *Mahānimittas*.

---

[1] Jaina-Sūtras, Part 1, Introd., p. xii.

[2] Hoernle's Appendix I, pp. 4-11.

(*e*) Visit of Mahāvīra to Sāvatthi, accompanied by his chief disciple Indabhūi and by Āṇaṁda, Savvâṇubhūi and Suṇakkhatta among his other disciples.

(*f*) Gosāla's conversation with Āṇaṁda whom he tried to convince by a story of some merchants and a fierce serpent in an ant-hill, that he possessed magic powers of destruction which the latter must beware of.

(*g*) His interview with Mahāvīra near Koṭṭhaga-ceiya and concealment of his former relations with the latter by means of his theory of re-animation.

(*h*) Mahāvīra's denunciation of Gosāla who acted like a thief in pretending himself to be a Jina.

(*i*) Destruction by Gosāla's magic power of two disciples of Mahāvīra,—Savvâṇubhūi and Suṇakkhatta who censured Gosāla for his improper behaviour towards his former teacher.

(*j*) Magic duel fought between Gosāla and Mahāvīra, which resulted in the defeat and discomfiture of the former.

(*k*) Advantage taken by the Nigganṭha ascetics under Mahāvīra's instruction of this mental state of Gosāla, and conversion of many Ājīviyas to the Jaina faith.

(*l*) Gosāla's shameless words and actions in the delirium of fever, *e.g.*, holding a mango in his hand, drinking, singing, dancing, improperly soliciting the potter-woman Hālāhalā, and sprinkling himself with the cool muddy water from a potter's vessel.

(*m*) Question of Ayaṁpula, an Ājīviya layman, as to the nature of the *Hallā* insect, and Gosāla's foolish reply (made after the attendant theras had taken away the mango which he was holding in his hand): "This which you see is not a mango, but merely the skin of a mango; you want to know what the *Hallā* insect is like; it is like the root of the bamboo, play the lute, brother, play the lute!"

(*n*) Development of a few new doctrines of the Ājīviyas from Gosāla's personal acts and from events at or about the time of his death, *viz.*,

(*i*) the doctrine of Eight Finalities (aṭṭha caramāiṁ); the last drink, the last song, the last dance, the last solicitation, the last tornado, the last sprinkling elephant,[1] the last fight with big stones as missiles, and the last Titthaṅkara who is Maṅkhaliputta himself [2];

(*ii*) the doctrine of Four Drinkables and Four substitutes (cattāri pāṇagāiṁ; cattāri apāṇagāiṁ)[3]: the former include what is excreted by the cow, what has been soiled by the hand (*e.g.*, the water in a potter's vessel), what is heated by the sun, and what drops from a rock; and the latter include—

(1) Holding a dish or a bottle or a pot or a jar which is cool or wet with water, instead of drinking from it;

(2) squeezing or pressing with one's mouth a mango or a hog-plum or a jujube fruit or a *tinduka* fruit when it is tender or uncooked, instead of drinking of its juice;

(3) squeezing or pressing with one's mouth *kalāya* or *mudga* or *māsa* or *simbali* beans when these are tender or uncooked, instead of drinking of their juice; and

(4) 'the—pure—drink' consisting in eating pure food for six months, lying successively, for two

---

[1] Seyaṇaga = Sk. Secanaka, the Sprinkler. In the Nirayāvaliyā Sutta (Warren's ed. 17) it is related that this elephant used to carry the royal ladies of Campā to their bath and sport in the Ganges. See Hoernle's Appendix I, p. 7, f. n.

[2] Hoernle rightly points out that the first four items refer to the last personal acts of Gosāla, and that of the remaining four items the first three refer to events which happened at or about the time of Gosāla's death. Appendix I, p. 7, f. n.

[3] The commentary explains *pāṇagāiṁ* by "jalaviśesā vratayogyāḥ, *i.e.*, kinds of water that are fit to be drunk by the ascetics; and *apāṇagāiṁ* by "pānaka-sadriśāni śitalatvena dāhôpaśama-hetava," *i.e.*, objects that resemble water, because, on account their coolness, they serve to assuage internal heat. Appendix I, p. 8, f. n.

months at a time, on the bare earth, on wooden planks and on darbha grass.

(*o*) Gosāla's prophecy that Mahāvīra, struck by his magic power, would die of typhoid fever in six months, and Mahāvīra's counter prophecies that the former having been hit by his magic power, would die of the same fever in seven days, while he himself, although attacked with the same malady would live for sixteen years longer the life of a Jina.

(*p*) Gosāla's repentance and confession of shame, and declaration that Mahāvīra was the true Jina while he himself was Gosāla, the son of Mankhali, a wicked man, whose body deserved to be dragged, after his death, by a rope for people to spit at, and buried with every mark of dishonour.[1]

(*q*) His death in the premises of Hālāhalā's pottershop and a public burial of his body with all honours, according to his original instructions.

(*r*) Synchronism of his death with the war between Kūṇiya and Ceḍaga.

(*s*) His rebirth as a Deva in the *Accuya* world (Accue Kappe), being the reward, as some of the Jainas believe, of his repentance and self-confession, followed by a long series of rebirths and redeaths, the first of which is represented by King Mahāpauma of Puṇḍa, at the foot of the Viñjhā mountains.

(*t*) Persecution of the Nigganṭha Samaṇas by King Mahāpauma at the instigation of the Ājīviyas whose royal patron he was, and destruction of the wicked king by the magic potency of the Jaina saint named Sumaṁgala.

(*u*) Blind worship of Mankhaliputta Gosāla whom his Ājīviya followers honoured as the last Titthankara.

---

[1] Heart of Jainism, p. 60, f. n

Those who are inclined to accept the Bhagavatī account of Gosāla's last days as true in the literal sense, may find their views beautifully expressed in Mrs. Stevenson's "Heart of Jainism" (p. 60), where she makes the following observation: "Now he (*i.e.*, Gosāla) brought forward another doctrine, that of re-animation, by which he explained to Mahāvīra that the old Gosāla who had been a disciple of his was dead, and that he who now animated the body of Gosāla was quite another person; this theory, however, deceived nobody and Gosāla, discredited in the eyes of the townspeople, fell lower and lower, and at last died as a fool dieth."

I have been at pains to place before the reader almost all the main facts to be gathered from the Bhagavatī account of Gosāla's last days, and that with the single object of enabling him to judge for himself how brittle and insufficient are the materials with which a systematic history of the post-Makkhali period of the Ājīviya religion is to be built. And any intelligent student of history, I am confident, can easily perceive that many real facts about the Ājīviyas lie buried under the debris of myth and sectarian misrepresentation. He may miss all other points, but not one, which, I believe, is the Jaina motive to make Gosāla who is the greatest Ājīviya teacher to appear as a mischievous mad man to posterity, to whom he bequeathed the richest treasures of his wisdom and erudition, and, above all, an invigorating message of hope through his theory of re-animation. I leave it to the future historian of the Ājīviyas to decide how far he had merited such inhospitable and impolite treatment in the hands of the Jaina author of the Bhagavatī Sūtra. But I cannot help making one or two observations in passing.

First, it does not surely speak well either of the Jaina author or of the Jaina order whose glory and powers the

former is so anxious to bring out in his account, that he has recorded without any apology the conduct of the Nigganṭha Samaṇas who had taken advantage of and doubly increased the mental worries and discomfiture of Gosāla by going to discuss with him some serious problems of Jaina religion and theology, and that at the opportune suggestion from Mahāvīra himself. However, in spite of his deliberate attempt to make the best use of Gosāla's words and actions in the delirium of fever, without a word of sympathy for the agony under which he suffered, he has not been able to conceal a few outstanding facts of the latter's life. He has mentioned, for instance, that the question which Ayaṁpula, an Ājīviya layman, put to his dying master was about the nature of the *Hallā* insect, just in the same way that he has related that the two ascetics, Mahāvīra and Gosāla, had separated in Siddhatthagāma on account of a doctrinal difference which arose between them in connexion with the latter's theory of re-animation. These two points, marking out as they do the beginning and close of his philosophic career, go only to indicate that he was a naturalist, one whose life was spent in the study of plants and all other forms of life, and in finding out scientific explanations for their peculiar characteristics, habits, experiences and destinies.

Secondly, I do not clearly see as to what spiritual advantage the Jaina author has sought to gain by describing Gosāla's fever as the dire consequence of a magic duel he had so foolishly fought with Mahāvīra, though not unaware of the fact that a Jaina himself was inclined to attribute the typhoid fever from which Mahāvīra himself suffered shortly afterwards to a similar cause.[1]

[1] Hoernle's Appendix, I, p. 10: "Soon after his arrival at the Sālakoṭṭhaga Ceiya near the town of Midhiyagāma, Mahāvīra got a severe attack of bilious fever,

I cannot, indeed, suggest any other plausible explanation for some of the later accounts, whether Jaina or Buddhistic, which seek to claim the superiority of Mahāvīra or of the Buddha, as a teacher, by his superior and overwhelming magical powers of destruction, than that in the absence of the master, the spirit of his teaching was entirely lost sight of by those of his followers who courted only popularity of their faith among superstitious people at large.

It seems true that the visit of Mahāvīra to Sāvatthi with his disciples who resembled in many respects the Ājīviyas but who were more exalted withal in social position and more refined in manners, and whose doctrines were more rational and articulate than, although similar in many points to, the Ājīviya, proved fatal to the reputation of the Ājīviya leader and checked further progress of the Ājīviya creed in the ancient city of Sāvatthi which is so famous also in the history of Buddhism. It may be a fact that some of the Ājīviyas were won over to the new faith of the Jainas which was rapidly spreading its net over the Mid-Land like a spider at the cost of the mother creed. But was the victory only one-sided, I would ask, or did Mahāvīra gain some only to lose others, despite the fact that he gained far more than lost? What does the Jaina author mean when he relates that Mahāvīra's disciples, Savvâṇubhūi and Suṇakkhatta, were killed by Gosāla's magical powers of destruction? I am of opinion that both Savvâṇubhūi and Suṇakkhatta were converted to the Ājīvika faith. As to Suṇakkhatta in particular there are two versions of an important Buddhist discourse, characterised as "horror-striking" (lomahaṁsa),[1] in both

and all the people of the town thought that Gosāla's prophecy was going to be fulfilled . . . . . This greatly troubled the mind of one of Mahāvīra's disciples, called Sīha."

[1] The discourse is embodied in the Mahāsīhanāda Sutta, Majjhima, I, pp. 68-83, and in the Lomahaṁsa-Jātaka (No. 94).

of which he is introduced as a Licchavi prince who severed his connexion with the Buddhist order, and in both the versions the Buddha sets up an enquiry into the tenets of Ājīvika religion, which is a circumstantial evidence proving that Suṇakkhatta had something to do and was in some way connected with the Ājīvikas at some later period of his life. All the stories about him, whether older or later, emphasize certain facts about his religious views and outlook which manifestly show that he was just the sort of man who attached greater spiritual value to outward asceticism than to the moral behaviour of a recluse, and whose standard of judgment of a teacher's greatness consisted in mystical faculties and magic rather than in self-culture and rationality. He had joined the Buddhist Order apparently in the hope of finding in the great Buddha and his religion of the Middle Path all that he wanted to get, and when disappointed, he left it to join with a Korakhattiya in repudiating the Buddha in public as a theorist without higher intellectual perception and superhuman faculties.[1] According to Garuḍa Gosvāmin's Amāvaṭura, he next attached himself to a Jaina recluse named Kaḷāramaṭṭhuka, and again returned to the Buddha only to go back again to a self-conceited Jaina named Pāṭikaputta. It was while the Buddha was staying in the Pāṭikârāma, near Vesāli, that he gave his famous 'horror-striking' discourse by dwelling on the religious views of Suṇakkhatta which were consonant with the Ājīvika

---

[1] "N'atthi Samaṇassa Gotamassa uttarimanussaadhammo alamariyañāṇadassanaviseso, takkapariyâhataṁ samaṇo Gotamo dhammaṁ deseti." The Lomahaṁsa Jātaka relates that Suṇakkhatta reverted to a lay life through the influence of Kora the Kṣatriya about the time when this latter had been reborn as the offspring of Kālakañjaka Asura. The Mahāsīhanāda Sutta does not mention Kora Khattiya. The story of Suṇakkhatta in the Singhalese Amāvaṭura seems to have been based upon the Pātika-Sutta of the Dīgha Nikāya, Vol. III. The older version of the story is to be discussed in Part II, Chap. I.

faith and discipline. The Mahāsīhanāda Sutta, which lays the scene in a forest-grove, in the western suburb of Vesāli, embodies a more detailed analysis and elaborate discussion of the principles and practices of the Ājīvikas, and this older account in the Majjhima confirms, as will be shown anon, the Jaina account in the Bhagavatī in many important phases of Ājīvikism as it developed after the Nirvāṇa of Gosāla. Thus with the aid of contemporary and subsequent accounts from the Buddhists I can suggest that the true meaning of the Jaina statement about the destruction of Suṇakkhatta[1] by Gosāla's magical powers is that he passed many a time from one order to another, and that the last order which he joined and the last faith in which he died was the Ājīviya.

Next as to Mahāvīra's prophecy that Gosāla having been hit by his magic power must die of bilious (typhoid) fever in seven days, I doubt if it can be viewed as sober history. This prophecy of his is in conflict with his statement that eight new practices of the Ājīviyas emerged from Gosāla's personal acts. Considering that the first seven practices—drinking what is excreted by the cow, what has been soiled by the hand, etc., are traceable in his acts in the delirium of fever, a presumption is apt to arise that the eighth practice, called the Pure Drink, also arose from his personal example, and as we know, to practise this hard penance of suicidal starvation, the Ājīviyas had to lie down for six months, lying successively for two months at a time on the bare earth, on wooden planks and on *darbha* grass. If the Ājīviyas observed this practice in blind imitation of their master, as I believe they did, Mahāvīra's prophecy can be reconciled with his statement about Gosāla's

[1] The story of Suṇakkhatta in the Dhammapada commentary and the Amāvaṭura goes on to relate that his dead body was dragged by a rope to the charnel field (āmaka-susāna).

death only by the supposition that he did not actually die in seven days, but survived the attack of fever for a period of six months, during which he practised the penance of Pure Drink in the manner above described, and attained after his death to the immutable world (Accue Kappe).

The new Ājīviya doctrine of eight finalities preserves the memory of a war between Kūṇiya and Ceḍaga, and these reminiscences, combined with Mahāvīra's second prophecy that Gosāla would predecease him by sixteen years, can serve to furnish a clue to the date of Gosāla's death, being synchronous with some natural and political events such as tornado and war, which left its influence on Ājīviya religion. An account of this war is embodied in the Nirayāvaliyā sutta[1], but it would be an unpardonable digression here to discuss the complicated question of date. It can nevertheless be imagined that the strange coincidence of Gosāla's death with tornado and war made such a deep impression on the Ājīviyas as to lead them to associate these events in their memory, to look upon them as the work of some mysterious spiritual agencies and turn their coincidence into a doctrine: the last drink, the last song, the last dance, the last solicitation, the last tornado, the last sprinkling elephant, the last fight with big stones as missiles, and the last titthaṅkara who is Maṅkhaliputta himself.[2]

According to the Bhagavatī account Sāvatthi was the main centre of the Ājīviya activity during the leadership of Gosāla and subsequently, and this is confirmed by a few passages of the Vinaya Piṭaka pointing to Sāvatthi as the place where a naked ascetic was invariably

---

[1] Warren's edition, p. 17, foll.

[2] Bhagavatī, XV. 1. 1254: carime pāṇe, carime cāre, carime ṇaṭṭe, carime aṁjalikaṁme, carime pokkhalassa saṁvaṭṭae mahāmehe, carime seyaṇae gaṁdhahatthi, carime mahāsilakaṁtae...carime titthaṁkare.

sidered to be an Ājīvika. Professor D. R. Bhandarkar draws attention[1] to an interesting episode in the Mahāvagga recording two instances, where a maid in the service of lady Visākhā mistook the Buddhist bhikkhus for the Ājīvikas when she saw them "with their robes thrown off, letting themselves be rained down upon"[2] and the second time, when the bikkhus entered, into their respective chambers, taking off their robes after cooling their limbs and being refreshed in body.[3] The Ājīviya lay-disciples mentioned in the Uvāsagadasāo, the Bhagavatī sūtra and in the Dhammapada commentary were all either citizens of Sāvatthi or residents of some outlying districts and suburbs of Sāvatthi, and they are classed as rich potters and bankers as will appear from the following list :—

(1) Kuṇḍakoliya, resident of Sahassambavana near Kampillapura in the dominion of King Jiyasattū, *alias* Pasenādi Kosala. He married lady Pusā and is said to have possessed "a treasure of six kroṛ measures of gold deposited in a safe place, a capital of six kroṛ measures of gold, put out on interest, a well-stocked estate of the value of six kroṛ measures of gold and six herds, each herd consisting of ten thousand heads of cattle."[4] He had a seal inscribed with his name (nāma-muddā) and is addressed as the lay-disciple of the Samaṇa and beloved of the gods.[5] Subsequently he is said to have become a Jaina.

(2) Saddālaputta, a rich potter of Polāsapura, a town near Sahassambavana in the dominion of

[1] Ind. Ant., 1912, Vol. XLI, p. 288.

[2] Mahāvagga, VIII, 15.3. Vinaya Texts, S. B. E., Part II, p. 217.

[3] Mahāvagga, VIII, 15.4. Vinaya Texts, op. cit. p. 218.

[4] Hoernle's edition and translation of the Uvāsaga Dasāo, VI, 163.

[5] *Ibid*, VI. 166 : " Haṁ bho Kuṇḍakoliya samaṇôvāsayā . devâṇuppiyā."

King Jiyasattū. He married Aggimittā and vied with Kuṇḍakoliya in opulence.[1] He ran 500 potteries where a large number of employees received food in lieu of wages, day by day, prepared a large number of bowls, pots, pans, pitchers and jars of six different sizes,[2] and used to carry on a trade on the king's high-road with that large number of bowls and jars of various sizes.[3] He, too, is said to have become a Jaina later on.

(3) Hālāhalā, a potter-woman in whose premises in Sāvatthi Maṅkhaliputta found shelter and lived and died.

(4) Ayaṁpula, a citizen of Sāvatthi.

(5) Migāra,[4] a banker of Sāvatthi, who possessed 40 Kroṛ measures of gold (cattālisakoṭiyo mahāseṭṭhi). His son Puṇṇavaḍḍhana married the Buddhist lady Visākhā, daughter of Dhanañjaya, a banker of Magadha, naturalised subsequently in Kosala. The banker Migāra got rid of his Ājīvika creed and embraced the Buddhist faith through the instrumentality of his daughter-in-law. Hence the standing epithet *Migāramātā*, the mother of Migāra, applied to the name of Visākhā.

There are a few Buddhist discourses which bear out the fact that the Ājīvika propaganda work was not confined to Kosala, but ranged over a wider area extending as far west as Avanti, and as far east as the frontier district of Bengal (Vaṅgantajanapada). For instance, in a passage of the Majjhima Nikāya, a Brahman wanderer tells the Buddha that Aṅga and Magadha were seething with

[1] *Ibid*, VII. 182.

[2-3] Uvāsaga Dasāo, VII. 183.

[4] Dhammapada Commentary, p. 384, foll.

speculative ferment stirred up by the six titthaṅkaras of whom Makkhali Gosāla was one[1]; and in another passage Sāriputta informs Moggallāna that he met an Ājīvika named Paṇḍuputta, the son of a coach-repairer, near Rājagaha.[2] The story of Upaka, of which there are several versions in the Buddhist literature,[3] relates that the Buddha had met the Ājīvika *en route* to Benares from Gayā, shortly after his enlightenment. According to a later version of the same story in the Suttanipāta-commentary, Upaka having parted company with the Buddha proceeded as far east as the frontier district of Bengal where he was entertained by a fowler with meat broth. He fell in love with Cāpā, the fowler's daughter, and when their love affair was disclosed she was given him in marriage. He became sick of household life after Cāpā had given birth to a son and went back to the Buddha whom he came to look upon as *ananta-jina*, the peerless Master. The District where he had so long lived as householder was situated outside the Middle Country, as may be inferred from the expression that "he proceeded towards the Majjhimadesa."[4] Thus, the Buddhist evidences can be brought to bear upon the Bhagavatī account which speaks of Rāyagiha, Uddaṇḍapura, Campā, Vāṇārasi, Ālabhiyā, Vesāli and Sāvatthi as the several successive centres of the Ājīviya activity.

A number of Gosāla's disciples survived him and amongst them may be included the Disācaras, and Suṇakkhatta and others. The Disācaras formed a group of six wandering mendicants before their conversion to the Ājīviya religion, and they are named Sāṇa, Kalanda,

[1] Majjhima-Nikāya, II, p. 2.

[2] *Ibid*, I, pp. 31-32.

[3] *Ibid*, I, p. 170, foll.; Therigāthā; Paramattha-jotikā, II, Vol. 7, pp. 258-260.

[4] Paramatthajotikā, II, Vol. I, p. 260: Majjhima desâbhimukho pakkami. The boundaries of the Middle Country are discussed by Prof. Bhandarkar with his characteristic thoroughness in his Carmichael Lectures, Lec. II, p. 42, foll.

Kaṇiyāra, Attheda, Aggivesāyaṇa, and Ajjaṇa Gomāyuputta.[1] Of them the last, *i.e.*, Ajjaṇa Gomāyuputta seems to have been the same person as the Ājīvika whom the Buddhist Thera Sāriputta met outside Rājagaha, and who is named Paṇḍuputta purāṇayānakāraputta in the Majjhima (I. p. 31)—Paṇḍu's son, *i.e.*, Ajjuna, the son of a repairer of old carts. The Disācaras met Gosāla in the 24th year of his mendicancy. The Bhagavatī account keeps us in the dark as to who they were before their interview with Gosāla. It represents them as if they had belonged to a separate school of thought and religious order, the past traditions (puvvas) whereof they collected and arranged into a canon consisting of eight Mahānimittas and two Maggas, which ultimately became the sacred literature of the Ājīviyas.[2] The account goes so far as to indicate that this literature sprang out of the extracts made by the Disācaras according to their own ideas from the Puvvas, and that Gosāla derived the six characteristic features of the organic world therefrom.

It seems *primâ facie* impossible that the six wanderers should have paid a visit to Gosāla with a literature of their own and that this literature should have been accepted by Gosāla and his disciples as canonical. The better interpretation would seem to be that the disciples of Gosāla who survived him assembled to collect and systematise the teachings of their master and the traditions of their order after Gosāla's death, and probably they formed a council of six for the purpose, a procedure followed later in principle by the Jainas and Buddhists after the death of their masters.

The Bhagavatī Sūtra does not explain what its author understood by the Puvvas wherein the eight

[1] Some texts read the names as Sāṇa, Kaṇaṁda, Kaṇiyāra, Acchida, Aggivesāyaṇa and Ajjuya Gomāyuputta.

[2] Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, Appendix II, p. 249.

Mahānimittas were contained, nor does it state what his idea was of the contents of the Ājīviya canon. The commentator says that the Maggas consisted of two treatises on music: gitamārga-nrityamārga-lakṣaṇaṁ, which is hardly correct.

It appears from the Bhadrabāhu inscription at Śravaṇa Belgoḷā[1] that the eight Mahānimittas formed part of the original Jaina canon, although no trace of them, as noticed by Prof. Leumann, can be found in the existing one.[2]

There seems to be much truth in Leumann's surmise; at any rate, the traditional connexion of the Mahānimittas and Maggas with the Puvvas can be rendered clear by the history of the Jaina canon. According to the Jaina tradition, whether Śvetâmbara or Digambara, "besides the Aṅgas, there existed other and probably older works, called Puvvas, of which there were originally fourteen."[3] The Śvetâmbara tradition says that the fourteen *Pūrvas* were incorporated in the twelfth Aṅga, the *Dṛiṣṭivāda*, which was lost in the 10th century after Mahāvīra's death. This tradition is in conflict with the Jaina interpretation of the word Puvva, according to which Mahāvīra himself taught the Puvvas to his disciples called the Gaṇadharas and the latter composed afterwards the Aṅgas. That there is some truth in this traditional interpretation none can deny.[4] The substance of Prof. Jacobi's views on this point is that the fourteen Puvvas or oldest sacred books of the Jainas were superseded by a new canon, for the very name Puvva means "former," *i.e.*, the earlier composition. The most natural interpretation of the tradition that the Aṅgas and the Puvvas existed side by

[1] Bhadra Bāhu and Śravaṇa Belgoḷā by Lewis Rice, Ind. Ant., Vol. III, p. 153. Aṣṭâṅgamahānimittaṁ = aṭṭhaṁgantha Mahānimittaṁ of the Bhagavatī Sūtra.

[2] Rockhill's Life of the Buddha, Appendix II, p. 249, f. n. 1.

[3] Jacobi's Jaina-sūtras, Part 1, Introd., p. xliv.

[4] Weber, Indische Studien, xvi, p. 353.

side up till the council of Pāṭaliputra, which was held in the 4th century B.C., is that the first eleven Aṅgas did not derive their authority from the Puvvas, and were in a sense later innovations.

As to the tradition that the 14 *Pūrvas* were incorporated in the Twelfth Aṅga, the *Dṛiṣṭivāda*, Prof. Jacobi justifies it by the contents of the Aṅga itself. The *Dṛiṣṭivāda*, as its name implies, dealt chiefly with the *dṛiṣṭis* or philosophical views of the Jainas and other schools. "It may be thence inferred that the *pūrvas* related controversies held between Mahāvīra and rival teachers. The title *pravāda* which is added to the name of each *pūrva*, seems to affirm this view." The Jaina scholars headed by Jacobi, Weber and others tend to hold that the *pūrvas* represented the older Jaina doctrines in their traditional form which were later abridged, systematized and partly superseded by the Aṅgas.[1]

The same process of abridgement, systematisation, and partial supplementation seems to have taken place in the growth of the Ājīvika canon. The eight Mahānimittas did not surely exhaust the *puvvas* when it is expressly stated that they were only contained in them, and consisted of extracts made thereof by the Disācaras according to their own ideas. Some idea of the contents of the Mahānimittas can be formed from the Bhadrabāhu inscription referred to above and quoted below :—

"Bhadrabāhu-svāminā Ujjayinyām aṣṭâṅga-mahānimitta-tatvajñena traikālya-darśinā nimittena dvādaśa saṁvatasara-kāla vaiṣamyam upalabhya."

The extract may be rendered as follows :—

"By Bhadrabāhu-svāmin, who possesses the knowledge of the Eight Mahānimittas, the seer of the past, present and future, was foretold by the study of signs a dire

[1] Hoernle's Introduction to his translation of the Uvāsaga Dasāo, p. x. See other references mentioned by him in a footnote.

calamity in Ujjayini, lasting for a period of twelve years. It is clear from this that the Eight Mahānimittas consisted chiefly of astrological and astronomical works. It is doubtful if the Maggas were treatises on music, as the Jaina commentator suggests. These dealt perhaps with the rules of the Ājīviya community. It is no wonder that these were later additions to the Ājīvika canon, although it is difficult to say when exactly these additions were made. The puvvas from which the abstracts on astrological and astronomical matters were derived contained perhaps, like the *Puvvas* of the Jainas, the philosophical views and controversies besides the rules of the Ājīviya order. The separation of the Mahānimittas from the general body of Ājīviya tradition was coeval probably with a change which came about in the life of the Ājīviyas after their master's death. The change is nothing else, as will be pointed out hereafter, than that the Ājīviyas departing from the line of strict religious discipline and purpose of their Masters inclined more and more to make astrology and divination their profession.

The literary traditions of the Ājīviyas, like those of many other schools of thought, have been lost perhaps for ever, and no one knows where to seek for them or what fruitful results they will yield when discovered. At the present state of our knowledge, I can only say that the Ājīviyas, like the Jainas and the Buddhists, had a literature of their own, and it is painful to think that it should have been irrevocably lost. From the evidence of the Bhadrabāhu inscription of Śravaṇa Belgoḷā the historian is tempted to believe that it is not lost absolutely, but that it has survived in some form or other in the existing literature of the Jainas, the Buddhists and the Brāhmans, and chiefly in that of the Jainas.

A few stereotyped fragments that have survived in the Jaina and Buddhist literatures seem to preserve

certain turns of expressions which, meagre though they are, bear evidence to the fact that the Ājīvikas had developed a literary medium or vehicle of expression and scientific nomenclature of their own, closely allied to the Dialect on one side, and to Ardhamāgadhi on the other, distant from Pāli and still more distant from Sanskrit. It is difficult, as in the case of Ardhamāgadhi and Pāli, to point out any local dialect on which the Ājīvika language was based. Considering that Sāvatthi was the main centre of their religious propaganda during the leadership of Gosāla and subsequently, one may be tempted to hold that it was derived mainly from the dialect of Kosala, while its scientific nomenclature was partly coined and partly derived from the Brahmanical literature then extant. But the objection will arise that if their language was of a local origin, how could it be spoken and well understood over the whole of the Middle Country, or why should it be different, however slightly, from Ardhamāgadhi and Pāli, although Sāvatthi was as much the centre of the Ājīvikas as that of the Jainas and Buddhists? I am far from saying that their language was entirely free from all local influences, but I must say that in the study of the growth of literary languages in the sixth century B.C., no less than in that of the rise of different political powers and religious orders, the historian and the philologist will do well to bear in mind that the tribal, caste and communal factors were far more potent and operative than local. To take an illustration: supposing that the languages of the Ājīvika canon and Buddhist Piṭaka had developed side by side in Kosala, where the local influences were theoretically the same, the differences between them in matters of phonetics, syntax and affinity with Sanskrit can be best accounted for not so much by a grand theory of provincial peculiarities

as by that of tribal, caste and communal differentiations, conscious or unconscious. The communal differentiation is conscious, while the tribal and caste differentiations are generally unconscious, and conscious only where a member of a tribe or caste makes himself conspicuous to his fellows by his imitation of the diction and accent of some other tribe or caste. The tribal or race influence is partly local in so far as a place is inhabited by a tribe or a race. Proceeding on these lines, the greater refinement of Pāli and its closer affinity with Sanskrit can be explained by the fact that it had originated with a highly cultured member of an aristocratic clan, and was adapted to the languages of the nobility and learned Brāhmans, while the Ājīvika language having originated with a person of lower social position, and having been adapted to the dialects of the Vaiśyas, *e.g.*, the bankers, the potters and the coach-builders, naturally lacked grammatical precision, the purity of diction, and refinement in tone This is confirmed by the fact that wherever in the Nikāyas we come across homely dialogues and folk-tales, similes and maxims, it is found that the language differs invariably from the standard Pāli of the Buddhist Theras and Theris, and approximates more or less to the Dialect, *i.e.*, to the language of the Middle Country with its local, tribal and caste variations. A fuller discussion of this intricate linguistic problem is reserved for Part II. Here I must remain content with citing a few instances in order to illustrate the nature of the Ājīvika language under notice.

1. (*a*) The doctrine of Gosāla is reproduced in Ardhamāgadhi :

“ Gosālassa Maṅkhaliputtassa dhammapaṇṇatti : n'atthi uṭṭhāṇe i vā kamme i vā bale i vā vīrie i vā purisaparakkame i vā— niyayā sabbabhāvā ” (Uvāsaga Dasāo, VI, 166).

(*b*) The same is reproduced in Pāli:

"N'atthi attakāre n'atthi parakāre n'atthi purisakāre, n'atthi balaṃ n'atthi vīriyaṁ n'atthi purisa-thāmo n'atthi purisa-parakkamo. Sabbe sattā sabbe pāṇā sabbe bhūtā sabbe jīvā avasā abalā avīriyā niyati-saṅgati-bhāva-pariṇatā" (Dīgha., I, p. 63).

(*c*) The same abridged and more adapted to Pāli reads:

"N'atthi balaṁ n'atthi vīriyaṅ n'atthi purisatthāmo n'atthi purisaparakkamo, sabbe sattā..........abalā avīriyā niyati-saṅgati-bhāva pariṇatā (Majjhima, I, p. 407).

2. (*a*) Caurâsīti mahākappasayasahassāiṁ, satta-divve, satta saṁjūhe, satta saṇṇigabbhe, satta pauṭṭaparihāre, pañca kammanisaya-sahassāiṁ saṭṭhiṁ ca sahassāni cha ca satiṇṇiya kammaṁse aṇupuvveṇaṁ kha-vaittā tau pacchā sijjhanti bujjhanti jāva aṅtaṁ karenti"[1] (Bhagavatī, XV. 1.).

(*b*) "Cuddasa kho pan' imāni yoni-pamukha-sata-sahassāni saṭṭhiñ ca satāni cha ca satāni, pañca ca kammāni tīṇi ca kammāni kamme ca aḍḍha-kamme ca, dvaṭṭhi-paṭipadā...... satta saññigabbhā satta asaññigabbhā, satta nigaṇṭhigabbhā, satta devā satta mānusā, satta pesācā,[2] .... satta supinā, satta supina-satāni, cullâsīti

[1] In some edition the text reads: sijjhanti bujjhanti muccaṁti pariṇivvāiṁti sabba dukkhāṇaṁ aṁtaṁ kariṁsu vā kariṁti vā karissaṁti vā. The phrase jāva aṁtaṁ karenti frequently occurs in the Bhagavatī, XV. 1.

[2] The variant is *pisācā*. This reading is adopted by the commentator.

mahā-kappuno [1] satasahassāni yāni bāle ca paṇḍite ca sandhāvitvā saṁsaritvā dukkhass' antaṁ karissanti" (Dīgha, I, p. 54).

3\. (*a*) "Se-jje ime gām'-āgāra jāva saṇṇivesesu Ājīviyā bhavanti, taṁ jahā: du-gharâṇtariyā ti-gharâṇtariyā satta-gharâṇtariyā uppalaveṇṭiyā ghara-samudāṇiyā vijjuyâṇtariyā uṭṭiya-samaṇā" (Aupapātika Sūtra, Sec. 120).

(*b*) "Acelakā muttâcārā hatthâpalekhanā na ehibhadantikā na tiṭṭhabhadantikā na abhihataṁ na uddissakataṁ na nimantanaṁ sādiyanti, ... Te ekāgārikā va honti ekalopikā, dvâgārikā va honti dvâlopikā, sattâgarikā va honti sattâlopikā . . . ." (Majjhima, I, p. 238).

The reader may notice that in the instances cited above the language is not that of the Ājīvikas, certain views and rules of theirs being reproduced in highly crystallised and distorted forms by the Jainas and Buddhists in their own languages, *i.e.*, in Ardhamāgadhi and Pāli respectively. In so doing, they have retained just a few turns of expressions and grammatical forms which appear to stand nearer to Ardhamāgadhi or Jaina Prākrit. For instance, in the Jaina extract 1(*a*), the nominative singulars, whether masculine or neuter, have for their case-ending *e*, while in Pāli declension the case-ending in similar cases is *o* for masculine stems and *aṁ* for neuter. The Jaina extract reads: "n' atthi uṭṭhāne i vā . . . . purisaparakkame i vā." The Buddhist extract from the Dīgha, catalogued as 1(*b*), contains similar grammatical forms in "n' atthi atta-kāre n'atthi para-kāre n'atthi

[1] The reading Mahākappuno is accepted in the commentary.

purisakāre," while these expressions are altogether omitted in the extract from the Majjhima, marked 1(*c*), where the Ājīvika language is more adapted to Pāli. The contrast in view can at once be brought out by comparison of 1(*a*) and 1(*c*).

1(*a*): n'atthi bale i vā vīriye i vā purisa-parakkame i vā.

1(*c*): n'atthi balaṁ n'atthi vīriyaṁ n'atthi purisathāmo n'atthi purisa-parakkamo.

It may be inferred from this that the Ājīvikas did not draw any distinction in their declension between masculine and neuter stems ending in *a*, in so far as the nominative singular is concerned. *Mahākappuno* occurs in 2(*b*) as a genitive singular of *mahākappa*, whereas the genitive plural *mahākappānaṁ* would have fitted more the context, if the language had been Pāli. Moreover, the genitive singular of *mahākappa* is always *mahākappassa* in Pāli.

The extract 2(*b*) also contains an Ājīvika word *supina*, the meaning of which is confounded by the Buddhist commentator with that of the Pāli word *supina.* "Satta supinā, satta supina-satāni." Professor Rhys Davids following the authority of Buddhaghosa's commentary, renders these expressions by "seven principal and seven hundred minor sorts of dreams."[1] *Supina* stands in Pāli for *dream*, and Buddhaghosa naturally explains it: "supinâti mahāsupinā, supinasatānîti khuddaka supina-satāni."[2] but as a matter of fact, the word is Ājīvika and denotes bird, like its analogous forms suviṇa in Ardhamāgadhi, supaṇṇa or suvaṇṇu in Pāli and suparṇa in Sanskrit. These forms—*supina*, *suviṇa*, *supaṇṇa*, and *suparṇa*, when put side by side, can well indicate the relative position of the Ājīvika language, Ardhamāgadhi, Pāli and Sanskrit.

[1] Dial, B. II, p. 72.

[2] Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, I, p. 164.

The Buddhist story of Upaka preserves an Ājīvika expression "huveyya pâvuso"[1] with its variants "hupeyya pâvuso,"[2] "hupeyya āvuso,"[3] which is Sanskritised in the Lalita Vistara as "tad bhaviṣyasi Gautama,"[4] and may be rendered "perhaps it may be so, my good friend!"[5] *Huveyya* or *hupeyya* which is an optative form of the verbal root √bhū is not a recognised Pāli word, the usual Pāli form of the verb being *bhaveyya*. It appears moreover from the variants mentioned above that the sounds *p* and *v* were interchangeable in the Ājīvika language. Furthermore, in a later version of the same story,[6] the Buddhist commentator displays humour by reproducing Upaka's actual words: "sace Cavaṁ labhāmi, jīvāmi; no ce, marāmîti," *i.e.*, "If I gain Cāvā, I will live; if not, I will die." The Ceylonese edition of Buddhaghosa's Papañca Sūdani (p. 388) supplies a variant of the above reading, which is "Chavaṁ labhami, jīvāmi; no ce, marāmîti."[7] Here the name *Cāvā* or *Chavā* whereby Upaka refers to the fowler's daughter with whom he fell in love is not Pāli, the usual Pāli form of the name being *Cāpā*.[8] It also may be noted that the use of the present tense *marāmi* instead of the future form *marissāmi* is unidiomatic in Pāli. The idiomatic use of the verb can be best illustrated by these two sentences: "Yena tena upāyena gaṇha, sace na labhissāmi marissāmîti"[9]; "marissāmi no gamissami n'atthi bāle sahāyatā."[10] That the general tendency of

---

[1] Majjhima, I, p. 171; Paramattha-jotikā, II, Vol. I, p. 258.

[2-3] Mahāvagga, Vol. 1, p. 8.

[4] Lefmann's Lalita-vistara, p. 406.

[5] Papañca-Sūdani, Ceylonese edition, p. 388: evaṁ pi nāma bhaveyya.

[6] Paramāttha-jotikā, II, Vol. I. p. 258.

[7] *Cf.* Paramattha-jotika, II, Vol. I, p. 259. "Sace chāvaṁ labhāmi, jīvāmi, no cemarāmîti."

[8] Paramattha-jotikā, II, Vol. I, p. 258.

[9] Anderson's Pali Reader, p. 1.

[10] Dhammapada-commentary, I, p. 17.

the Pāli idiom is to use the future tense in such cases is evident also from the extracts 2(*a*) and 2(*b*). Instead of "jāva aṁtaṁ kareṁti" in the Jaina extract 2(*a*) we meet with "dukkhass' antaṁ karissanti" in the Buddhist extract 2(*b*). I need not multiply instances here. The cases already cited include instances where the masculine and neuter stems ending in *a* are not distinguished in declension in so far as the nominative singular is concerned, and where the numbers and tenses are not properly differentiated. Are these not sufficient to justify the surmise that the Ajīvika language may be judged from its crude grammatical forms as standing nearest to the Dialect and closely allied to Ardhamāgadhi?

With regard to two new Ājīviya doctrines which are said to have been formulated on the basis of Gosāla's personal acts and incidents, I find substantial agreement between the Jaina and Buddhist accounts. The doctrines as enumerated in the Bhagavatī Sūtra comprise (1) that of eight Finalities, and (2) that of four Drinkables and four Substitutes. These are interdependent as the last drink which is included in the former seems to have afforded a basis for the latter. It is not easy to understand the real signification of the doctrine of eight Finalities: the last drink, the last song, the last dance, the last solicitation, the last tornado, the last sprinkling elephant, the last fight with big stones as missiles, and the last Titthaṅkara who is Maṅkhaliputta himself. Of these, the first four items refer, as pointed out by Dr. Hoernle, to Gosāla's delirious acts, and of the remaining four, the first three items refer to events that happened at or about the time of Gosāla's death. The conjunction or coincidence of the death of Gosāla, the last Ājīviya Titthaṅkara, with tornado and war was *primâ fácie* turned into a theological doctrine of which the meaning is obscure. The doctrine finds no mention in the Buddhist literature,

nor is any explanation of it given in the Bhagavatī Sūtra. But the last item which relates to the Ājīviya attitude towards Gosāla may furnish a clue to its meaning; it goes to show that Gosāla came to be regarded as the last Titthaṅkara of the Ājīviyas. This is corroborated by the evidence of the Buddhist texts which state that the Ājīvikas recognised only three persons as their leaders or peerless masters (anantajinas) of whom Makkhali was the last. In a Sutta of the Majjhima Nikāya the Brāhman wanderer Sandaka says, "The Ājīvikas act like sons of those whose sons are dead. They exalt themselves and disparage others, and recognise three only as their leaders, *viz.*, Nanda Vaccha, Kisa Saṁkicca, and Makkhali Gosāla."[1] It appears from the Aṅguttara explanation of Gosāla's doctrine of six *abhijātis*, wrongly ascribed to Pūraṇa Kassapa, that the Ājīvikas placed their three leaders in the supremely white class, while they placed themselves in just the white class and their lay disciples in the yellow. The Jaina expression "last Titthaṅkara" also implies that the Ājīviyas recognised more titthaṅkaras than one. It is important to note that Gosāla came to be honoured as the last Ājīvika titthaṅkara in the life-time of the Buddha. This enables us to surmise that he predeceased the Buddha, although it is difficult to say by how many years. Seeing that the Ājīvikas looked back to Gosāla after his death as their last Titthaṅkara or peerless master, one can suggest the following as the most natural and probable interpretation of the doctrine of eight Finalities: the synchronism of Gosāla's death with such natural and political events as tornado and war was quite providential, and that it is to be regarded as a divine testimony of Gosāla being the last titthaṅkara, whose death was

[1] Majjhima, I. p. 524: Ājīvikā puttamatāya puttā, attānañceva ukkaṁseti paraṁ vaṁbhenti, tayo cêva niyyātaro paññāpenti, seyyathīdaṁ Nandaṁ Vacchaṁ, Kisaṁ Saṁkiccaṁ, Makkhaliṁ Gosalāṁ.

rendered doubly significant in human history by its coincidence with many other tragic and fateful occurrences.

It seems to me that the practices of four Drinkables and four Substitutes were all connected with the hard penance of suicidal starvation to which the Ājīviyas attached a peculiar religious sanctity and spiritual value, and that these appertained to three successive stages of religious suicide (maraṇa indiya) as the Jainas call it. In the first stage, the dying Ājīviya saint was permitted to drink something, *e.g.*, what is excreted by the cow, what has been soiled by the hand, what is heated by the sun, and what drops from a rock; in the second stage, he was permitted not to drink anything but to use some substitutes, *e.g.*, to hold in his hand a dish or a bottle or a pot or a jar which is cool or wet with water, instead of drinking from it; to squeeze or press with his mouth a mango or a hog-plum or a jujube fruit or a *tinduka* fruit when it is tender or uncooked, instead of drinking of its juice; or to squeeze or press with his mouth *kalāya* or *mudga* or *māsa* or *simbali* beans when they are tender or uncooked, instead of drinking of their juice; while in the third or last stage, he had to forego even that. In practising the penance of Pure Drink the Ājīviya had to lie down for six months, lying successively for two months at a time on the bare earth, on wooden planks and on *darbha* grass. This indicates that the longest period allotted for the penance was six months, each stage of it having been gone through in two months, and therein lay the novelty of the Ājīviya method of attaining salvation by means of religious suicide. This new method of death by starvation seems to have been similar to the 'thrice-threefold way' (*tidhā tidhā*) introduced by Nāyaputta, *i.e.*, Mahāvīra,[1] as an improvement on the older method

[1] Āyāraṁga Sutta, I, 7.8.12: Ayaṁ se avare dhamme Nāyaputtena sāhie, āyavajjaṁ paḍīyāraṁ vijahejjā tidhā tidhā

adopted apparently by the followers of Pārśva, *e.g.*, by Mahāvīra's parents.[1] The underlying motives of this barbarous practice, as described in the Āyāraṁga Sutta,[2] are the following:

1. Riddance from kamma.
2. Endurance (titikkhā).
3. Sanctity of animal life.
4. Freedom from attachment.
5. Self-control.
6. Attainment of Nirvāṇa.[3]

The grand moral of the doctrine involved is:

"Jīviyaṁ nâbhikaṁkhejjā maraṇaṁ no vi patthae,
duhato vi na sajjejjā jīvite maraṇe tahā."

i.e., "He should not long for life, nor wish for death; he should yearn after neither, life or death."[4]

It appears from Buddha's representation of the Ājīvika religion in his Lomahaṁsa Discourse[5] that the Ājīvikas followed the same elaborate method for the attainment of the truth as for the attainment of the Accuta world. The Ajīvika religion is described there as "the higher life in its four forms" (caturaṅgasamannāgataṁ brahmacariyaṁ)[6] and its fundamental principles are summed up in the Mahāsihanāda Sutta[7] by these two expressions: purification by food (āhārena suddhi) and purification by transmigration (saṁsārena suddhi). The four-fold brahmacariya consisted of—

1. Tapassitā—asceticism.[8]
2. Lūkhacariyā—austerity;

---

[1] *Ibid*, II, 15.16.

[2] *Ibid*, II, 7.8; II, 15.16.

[3] Lit. paramā titikkhā, *ibid*, I. 7.8.25. *Cf.* Dhammapada, verse 184: titikkhā Nibbānaṁ paramaṁ.

[4] Jacobi's Jaina Sūtras, part I. p. 75.

[5] The Lomahaṁsa Discourse in the Jātaka (Jātaka No. 94).

[6] Majjhima, I. p. 77; Jātaka, I. p. 391.

[7] *Ibid*, I. pp. 80-82.

[8] *Ibid*, I. p. 77; Jātaka, I. p. 390.

3. Jegucchitā—comfort-loathing,
and 4. Pavivittatā—solitude.

Of these, the first point, *i.e.*, *Tapassitā*, exhausts the description of the rules of the Ājīvika order as met with in the Mahāsaccaka[1] and a number of other suttas.[2] It seems to me that the fourfold brahmacariya was tacitly implied in *Tapassitā*, and was indeed the outcome of a further analysis of the older body of rules. According to the teaching of the caturaṅga brahmacaryya, the Ājīvika had to be an ascetic, the chief of ascetics; ugly in his habits beyond all others; comfort-loathing surpassing all others; and lonely with unsurpassed passion for solitude. As an ascetic (tapassitāya), he had to go naked, to be of loose habits, etc.; as ugly in his habits (lūkhasmiṁ) he had to allow his body to be covered with a coating of dust accumulating for many years without thinking yet of rubbing it off by his own hand, or having it rubbed off by the hand of others; as comfort-loathing (jegucchismiṁ), he had to move about being mindful so as to bestow his love on a drop of water, and careful not to hurt small creatures; and as solitary recluse (pavivittasmiṁ), he had to flee like a deer from the face of men. The great moral involved in this mode of holy life is :—

"So tatto,[3] so sīto,[4] eko bhiṁsanake vane,
naggo na câggim āsīno, esanāpasuto munîti"[5]

i.e., "Bescorched, befrozen, lone in the fearsome woods,
Naked, no fire beside, all afire within,
The hermit is bent on seeking the truth."[6]

As regards his food, the Ājīvika had to live on jujube fruits, and on *muggas*, *tilas* and *tandulas*, whole

---

[1] Majjhima, I. p. 238; *cf.* p. 77.
[2] Aṅguttara, Part I,p. 295.
[3] *Cf.* variant Sutatto, Majjhima, p. 536.
[4] *Cf.* variant so sīno, *ibid*, I,p. 536.
[5] Majjhima, I,p. 79; Jātaka, I,p. 390.
[6] *Cf.* Jātaka translation, I,p. 230; Dial. B. II. p. 208.

or powdered. On this point the account of the Lomahaṁsa Jātaka differs from that of the Mahāsīhanāda Sutta just described. The former describes the Ājīvika as the ascetic "unclothed and covered with dust, solitary and lonely, fleeing like a deer from the face of men, whose food was small fish, cowdung, and other refuse."[1]

It has been shown that Rāyagiha, Uddaṇḍapura, Campā, Vāṇārasi Ālabhiyā, Vesāli and Sāvatthi were the successive and principal centres of Ājīvika activity up till the Jinahood of Gosāla. These names indicate that Ājīvikism which was at first a local movement of Rāyagiha spread within a century or more over the Middle Country, and that the progress of this movement proceeded along two paths, one leading to Campā as the most easterly point, and the other to Sāvatthi as the extreme western limit. At this various centres the Ājīvikas had to encounter two formidable enemies, the Jaina and the Buddhist, besides the Brāhman and the Kumāraputta,[2] their common enemies. It appears from Gosāla's division of time that the Ājīvika movement was confined even under his leadership, within the land of the seven rivers (satta sarā), or more accurately, to the Gangetic valley.[3] The scenes of the early years of Gosāla's career as a mendicant are laid round Rāyagiha and Paṇiyabhūmi. The latter was probably the farthest point in the South-east which lay outside the territorial division of the

[1] Jātaka, I, p. 390; Ājīvikapabbajjaṁ pabbajitvā acelako ahosi rajojalliko, pavivitto ahosi ekavihārī, manusse disvā migo viya palāyi, mahāvikatabhojano ahosi macchagomayâdīni paribhuñji.

[2] Pārśva's followers were called *Kumārasamaṇas*. (Uttarâdhyayana, lecture 23) or Nigganṭha samaṇas, Kumāraputtas (Sūyagaḍaṁga II. 7. 6).

[3] Satta sarā are, according to Buddhaghosa's commentary, seven great lakes, *viz.*, Kaṇṇamuṇḍa, Rathakāra, Anotatta, Sīhappapāta, Tiyaggala, Mucalinda, Kuṇāladaha (Sumaṅgalavilāsini I. p. 164). This does not seem to be correct. In the Bhagavatī Sūtra we meet with the names of seven rivers *viz.*, Gaṅgā, Sādinagaṅgā, Madugaṅgā Lohiyagaṅgā, Avatīgaṅgā, and Paramâvatīgaṅgā (Rockhill's Life of the Buddha p. 253).

Middle Country. Puṇiyabhūmi seems to have been a river-port in Western Bengal.[1] Indeed, so far as the easterly point is concerned, it can be shown that Western Bengal became a scene of the Ājīvikas and the older Nigganṭhas (Pārśva's followers) even before the Jinahood of Gosāla. According to the Bhagavatī account Gosāla and Mahāvīra met each other in Nālaṁdā and thenceforward they lived together for six years in Paṇiyabhūmi, which was a place according to the Jaina commentaries in Vajjabhūmi, elsewhere, described as one of the two divisions of Lāḍha.[2] The Āyāraṁga Sutta contains a fine Prākrit ballad,[3] where it is related that Mahāvīra wandered for some time as a naked mendicant in Lāḍha of which Vajjabhūmi and Subbhabhūmi were apparently two divisions. Lāḍha is described as a pathless country (duccara).

The rude natives of the place generally maltreated the ascetics. When they saw the ascetics, they called up their dogs by the cry of "Chucchū"[4] and set them upon the samaṇas. It was difficult to travel in Lāḍha. It is said that many recluses lived in Vajjabhūmi where they were bitten by the dogs and cruelly treated in a hundred other ways. Some of the recluses carried bamboo staves in order to keep off the dogs (laṭṭhiṁ gahāya ṇālīyaṁ).[5] We have seen that Upaka, the Ājīvika, described himself, while he has living in a frontier district of Bengal, as a mendicant carrying a staff, his expression "laṭṭhihattho pure āsiṁ" implying that the Ājīvikas habitually went about with a staff in hand, which was a matter of necessity with them. These Jaina and Buddhist references can well explain why Pāṇini described the

[1] According to the commentary of the Kalpasūtra, it is a place in Vajrabhūmi.
[2] Śīlāṅka's tīkā on the Āyāraṁgasutta 1. 8, 3, 2.
[3] Ohāṇasūya, the discourse which is to be listened to. Āyāraṁga, 1. 8.
[4] Āyāraṁga I. 8. 3. 4.
[5] *Ibid*, I. 8. 3. 5.

Maskariṇa as a class of wanderers provided with bamboo staves (maskara-maskariṇo-veṇuparivrājakayoḥ). So far as the westerly point is concerned, we have seen that towards the close of Gosāla's life the Ājīviyas were being driven even out of Sāvatthi. The Buddhist literature alse preserves a few episodes where the Ājīvikas came into conflict with the Buddhists in Sāvatthi.[1] It is mentioned in the Bhagavatī Sūtra that the Ājīvika centre was shifted not long after Gosāla's death to Puṇḍa, a country at the foot of the Viñjhā mountains, of which the capital was a city provided with a hundred gates (Sayaduvāra). A king Mahāpauma (Mahāpadma), otherwise known as Devaseṇa and Vimalavāhaṇa, is said to have persecuted the Jainas at the instigation of the Ājīviyas, whose royal patron he was. The wicked king was destroyed by the magical powers of a Jaina saint named Sumaṅgala, the disciple of Arahat Vimala.[2] It is also recorded in the Bhagavatī that Ambaḍa Daḍhapaiṇṇa, a wealthy citizen of the great Videha country, sought to bring about a reconciliation between the hostile sects by conferring with the Jainas.[3] The fifteenth chapter of the Bhagavatī Sūtra seems to have been the record of an age when the Ājīvika and Jaina religions were spread over Aṅga, Vaṅga, Magaha, Malaya, Mālava, Accha, Vaccha, Koccha, Pāḍha, Lāḍha, Bajji, Moli, Kāsi, Kosala, Avaha and Sambhuttara, of which some are countries which were situated outside the territorial division of the Middle country, *e.g.*, Vaṅga, Malaya, Mālava, Accha, Koccha, Pāḍha, Lāḍha, Avaha and Sambhuttara.[4] The same chapter also points to an age when many Vedic and non-Aryan deities were affiliated to

---

[1] Visākhāvatthu, Dhammapada Commentary, IV. No. 8.

[2] Hoernle's Appendix, I, pp. 11-12.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 14.

[4] *Ibid*, pp. 6-7.

the Ājīviya pantheon, *e.g.*, Puṇṇabhadda, and Māṇibhadda, Sohamma, Saṇakkumāra, Bambha, Mahāsukka, Aṇaya and Āraṇa.[1] The Ājīvikas believed that to those who practised the penance of Pure Drink, two gods Puṇṇabhadda and Māṇibhadda appeared on the last night of six months, and held their limbs with their cool and wet hands; if they submitted then to their caresses, they furthered the work of serpents, and if they did not, then a mysterious fire arose in their bodies to consume them.[2] Puṇṇabhadda and Māṇibhadda are represented as if they were the local deities of Puṇḍa, where the twin gods were looked upon as generals of King Devaseṇa Mahāpauma.[3] We say that some of the non-Aryan and Vedic deities were affiliated into the Ājīvika pantheon, because in the Buddhist Niddesas the worshippers of Puṇṇabhadda and Maṇibhadda are described as representing two distinct groups of worshippers, distinct from the Ājīvikas, the Nigaṇṭhas and the rest. The Niddesa list includes the following, apparently under two categories of disciples (schools) and devotees (sects)—

(1) Disciples: the Ājīvikas, the Nigaṇṭhas, the Jaṭilas, the Paribbājakas, and the Aviruddhakas.

(2) Devotees: Worshippers of elephant, of horse, cow, dog, crow, Vāsudeva, Baladeva, Puṇṇabhaddadeva, Maṇibhaddadeva, Aggi, Nāga, Suvaṇṇa, Yakkha, Asura, Gandhabba, Mahārāja Canda, Suriya, Inda, Brahmā, Deva, and Disā.

Further, the Niddesa list points to a time when the religious sects started deifying, more or less, their heroes. The Aṅguttara Nikāya contains an older list of ten

---

[1] Hoernle's Appendix, I, p. 14.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 11.

[3] Cullaniddesa, pp. 173-174:—Ājīvika-sāvakānaṁ Ājīvikadevatā, Nigaṇṭha-sāvakānaṁ Nigaṇṭhadevatā etc., *cf.* Mahāniddesa, pp. 89-92.

religious orders of which five only are noticed in the Niddesa under the first category, while under the second category are included the various groups of devotees which are not to be found in the former.[1] The anomaly thus involved can perhaps be explained away by the supposition that some of the orders had died out when the Niddesa list was closed, *e.g.*, the Muṇḍasāvakas; or that the older list was considered as redundant, *e.g.*, in the case of the Paribbājakas and the Tedaṇḍikas; or that the Niddesa groups of devotees were promiscuously comprised under one name, *e.g.*, Devadhammika, the worshipper of deities in general. In support of the third hypothesis I may refer the reader to the commentarial fragment on precepts in the Brahmajālasutta, where there is reference to the worship of the sun, the worship of the mother earth, and the invocation of Sirī, the goddess of Luck[2]. But the reader can at once judge for himself that the deities and forms of worship mentioned in the Brahmajālasutta were not all foreign to the Vedic, and further that the worshippers of these deities did not form distinct groups or corporations[3]. Moreover, some of the deities and forms of worship mentioned in the Niddesas are referred to in Pāṇini's Aṣṭâdhyāyī[4] and the Jaina Upāṅga the Aupapātika Sūtra. The former speaks of devotion to Mahārāja, Vāsudeva, Arjuṇa, clan and country, while the latter makes mention of Vāsudeva, Baladeva, and Cakkavattī in whose existence the Jainas

---

[1] Aṅguttara, pt. III, Ājīvika, Nigaṇṭha, Muṇḍasāvaka, Jaṭilaka, Paribbājaka, Māgaṇḍika, Tedaṇḍika, Aviruddhaka, Gotamaka, Devadhammika. *Dial.* B. II. pp. 220-222.

[2] Dīghanikāya, I, pp.

[3] The following are mentioned in the Milinda, p. 191, as gaṇas: Mallā, Atonā, Pabbatā, Dhammagiriyā, Brahmagiriyā, Naṭakā, Naccakā, Laṅghakā, Pisācā, Maṇibhaddā, Puṇṇabhaddā, Candima-Suriyā, Siridevatā, Kali or Kāli-devatā, Sivā, Vāsudevā, Ghanikā, Asipāsā, Bhaddiputtā.

[4] Pāṇini, IV. 3. 95-100.

were called upon to believe. The very fact that Vāsudeva, Baladeva and Emperor were recognised by the Jainas among prominent personalities (Śalākāpuruṣas) is an evidence that some sort of synthesis took place among the different religious communities, living in the same country and perhaps under the same rule. Thus three different records of the Brāhmans, the Jainas and the Buddhists concur in pointing to a time when the rival religious sects had to make a compromise among them by accepting the deities of one another, especially to an epoch when the Emperor had to be worshipped as a god. The Mahābodhijātaka also bears testimony to the fact that politics (Khattavijjā) teaching that one should seek one's material advantage even by killing one's parents passed into a religious dogma.[1] All these seem to bring out one fact *viz.* that such changes in Indian religion were coeval with the foundation of an empire and consequent on the growth of the idea of personality in religion and state. Seeing that the beginnings of these developments were as old as the the Buddha's life-time,[2] it seems probable that the process of deification in religion and state ran side by side with the making of the Magadha Empire.

There can be no gainsaying that the Ājīvikas retained an important position during the Maurya rule. The Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra, which may be regarded in a sense as a faithful record of Candragupta's administration, prohibits by penal legislation entertainment of the Śākyas (Buddhists) and the Ājīvikas at the time of *śrāddha*

---

[1] Jātaka, Vol. V, p. 228: Khattavijjāvādī "Mātāpitarôpi māretvā attano va attho kāmetabbo" ti gaṇhāpesi. It is especially to be noted that the doctrine referred to is to be found in the verse-quotation from the canonical Jātaka Book, which is as old as the 4th century B.C., if not older, *cf.* p. 240.

[2] Aṅguttara, I. pp. 77: Tathāgato ca arahaṁ sammā sambuddho rājā ca cakkavattī......acchariyamanussā......(yesaṁ) kālakiriyā bahuno janassa anutappā ......dve thūparahā. Cf; Dīgha II. p. 142.

and sacrifice.[1] This is not surely to be cited as an incontestable proof of religious persecution in the face of other evidences proving that the ascetics in general were avoided by Indian peoples on such occassions.[2] The very sight of the saṁnyāsins, particulary of naked mendicants like the Ājīvikas, was repulsive to persons of good taste, especially to the womenfolk who were the custodians of good manners then as now. It is said of the Buddhist lady Visākhā that she remarked at the sight of the Ājīvikas: "Such shameless persons, completely devoid of the sense of decency, cannot be Arahants."[3] The same feeling is expressed more emphatically with regard to the naked Jaina ascetic in the Divyâvadāna through the mouth of a courtezan in the following verses:[4]

"Kathaṁ sa buddhimān bhavati puruṣo vyañjanâvitaḥ
lokasya paśyato yo' ayaṁ grāme carti nagnakaḥ
Yasyâyaṁ īdṛiśo dharmaḥ purastāl lambate daśā
tasya vai śravaṇau rājā kṣurapreṇāvakrintatu."

The real attitude of a Brāhmaṇ teacher of polity and minister of state like Viṣṇugupta or Cāṇakya towards the Ājīvikas and naked ascetics in general is clearly brought out in a story of the Pañcatantra.[5] The substance of the story is that Maṇibhadra, an unfortunate banker of Pāṭaliputra,[6] was directed by the angel Padmanidhi in dream to strike him with a *lakuṭa* when he would appear

---

[1] Shamaśastry's Arthaśāstra, 251: Those who entertained the Buddhists and the Ājīvikas at the time of *śrāddha* and sacrifice were punishable by a fine of 100 paṇas.

[2] The Paramatthajotikā, III. Vol. 1. p. 175 records the following Brahmanic belief: "maṅgalakiccesu samaṇadassanaṁ amaṅgalaṁ."

[3] Dhammapada Commentary, p. 400: "evarūpa hirottappavirahitā arahantā nāma nahonti."

[4] Divyâvadāna, p. 165.
Ibid, p. 370.

[5] Pañcatantra, ed. Kielhorn, V. 1.
Pāṭaliputra is placed in the Deccan (Dākṣiṇātye).

next morning before him in the guise of a Kṣapaṇaka, and strangely enough, carrying out the angel's suggestion the banker was much surprised to find the body of the Kṣapaṇaka transmuted into gold. A covetous barber who happened to witness this wonderful feat of miracle conceived a plan of obtaining gold by striking the Kṣapaṇakas with a *lakuṭa*. With this end in view, he lost no time to go to a Kṣapaṇaka monastery where after showing due honour to the *Jinendra*, he recited three couplets expressive of the religious sentiments of three sects—the Ājīvika, the Jaina and the Buddhist. The second couplet which strikes the keynote of the Ājīvika and Jaina faiths is:

> " Sā jihvā yā jinaṁ stauti, taccittaṁ yat jine rataḥ
> Tāveva ca karau ślāghyau yau tat pūjā karau. "
>
> " That is the tongue which praises the Lord;
> that the heart which is devoted to the Lord,
> and those hands are verily praiseworthy which honour Him."

Thus the cunning barber managed to induce the Kṣapaṇakas to accept invitation to dinner in his house, and when they came in a body next morning, he struck them with a strong *lakuṭa* as they stepped into his house one after another. The news of the murder and panic of the Kṣapaṇakas soon spread through the city. The barber was arrested, tried, found guilty and severely punished. The Kṣapaṇaka of the story is evidently a mixed character combining the Jaina with the Ājīvika. In the story itself the Kṣapaṇaka is described as a naked mendicant (nagnaka), a Digambara worshipper of the Jinas, replete with supreme knowledge (kevala-jñāna-śālinām). It goes to show that both the Jaina and the Ājīvika, in common with other naked ascetics, had pretension to supernaturalism and miracles, and that with them Jinahood constituted the highest ideal of human perfection. The name of the banker Maṇibhadra is itself

of great importance as confirming the Bhagavatī account representing the disciples of Gosāla as votaries of the twin angels Puṇṇabhadda and Māṇibhadda. Viṣṇugupta's teaching in the story is that the proper treatment by a householder of the shameless naked ascetics professing to possess supernormal faculties was to strike them with the very staff which some of them carried about them, to apply, in other words, his own Daṇḍanīti to the Daṇḍins. But this course was not meant to be adopted literally, since a principle which was valid in theory might lead to disastrous consequences when blindly adhered to in practice. The disastrous consequences here contemplated are typified in the story by the tragic fate of the Kṣapaṇakas and the barber.

Visākhadatta's Mudrārākṣasa which is one of the most important historical dramas in Sanskrit, dated between the 5th and the 6th century A.D.,[1] paints the character of a Kṣapaṇaka who, like the Kṣapaṇaka of the Pañcatantra story, is relegated to the same period, and is a mixed character[2] representing the Ājīvika and the Digambara Jaina under one name. Mr. Telang points out that Cāṇakya introduced the Kṣapaṇaka to Rākṣasa, and that a Brāhman minister became so close a friend of his as to speak of his heart itself having been taken possession of by the enemy when he saw him.[3] The chief motive of the play is not far to seek; Viśākhadatta in eulogising the shrewd political principles of the Indian Machiavelli sought to show how even a naked mendicant, houseless, dispassionate, meditating on the reality of the living principle (jīvasiddhi kṣapaṇaka) could be made a friend

[1] Mr. Telang places the date of the play between the 7th and the 8th century A.D., Mr. Vincent Smith between the 5th and the 6th century A.D., and Prof. Hillebrandt in 400 A.D.

[2] *Cf.* Telang's introduction to his edition of the Mudrārākṣasa, p. 17. Prof. Wilson thinks that kṣapaṇaka denotes in the play a Jaina, not a Buddhist.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 19.

of ferocious Mammon (Mudrārākṣasa) to serve as a tool of Cāṇakya (Cāṇakya-praṇidhi).[1]

The Kṣapaṇaka is introduced in the play as a mendicant with shaved head (muṇḍia muṇḍa),[2] speaking Prākrit instead of Sanskrit, an exponent of the reality of the living principle (jīvasiddhi),[3] respecting the teaching of the Arahants,[4] irascible or hot-tempered, greedy of lucre, adept in palmistry, fortune-teller, consulted for fixing lucky days, an hypocrite always crying out, "There is no iniquity for the followers,"[5] wishing success to laymen in their business concerns,[6] and proclaiming victory of the cause of righteousness.[7] But the Kṣapaṇaka in question serving as a spy or 'Cāṇakya's tool' as it is called, cannot be reasonably taken as a true representative of his order except under the supposition that his pretensions were characteristic of the naked medicants whom he was called upon to imitate in his outward demeanour. The picture drawn of the Kṣapaṇaka seems to have a touch of reality receiving confirmation from two older Sanskrit treatises, the Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra and the Vātsyâyana Kāmasūtra, which in their general form, style and purpose can be said to belong to the same materialistic age.

Vātsyâyana Kāmasūtra speaks of the houses and establishments of the female attendants, bhikṣuṇis, kṣapaṇikās and tāpasis as the fittest places for love-intrigues,[8] as in the much later treatises on poetics we find that the rule

---

[1] Mudrārākṣasa, Telang's edition, p. 258. Jīvasiddhirapi Cāṇakya-praṇidhi.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 222.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 252. Note that *jīva* is the first of the Jaina *navatattvas*.

[4] *Ibid*, p. 212 : Sāsanaṁ alihantānaṁ.

[5] "N'atthi pāvaṁ, n'atthi pāvaṁ sāvagāṇaṁ."

[6] "Kajjasiddhi hodu sāvagāṇaṁ."

[7] "Dhammasiddhi hodu sāvagāṇaṁ."

[8] Kāmasūtra, V. 4. 42 : Sakhī-bhikṣukī-kṣapaṇikā-tāpasi-bhavaneṣu sukhôpāyaḥ cf. *Ibid*, IV. 1.9 : Bhikṣukī-śramaṇā-kṣapaṇā-mūlakārikābhir na saṁsṛijyeta. I am indebted to Pandit Bidhu Shekhar Bhattacharyya for these references.

is laid down to select female attendants, dancing girls and female ascetics to play the part of messengers in love intrigues,[1] which is illustrated in the Mālatī Mādhava by the character of the Buddhist sister Kāmandakī, busy with her disciple Avalokitā and friend Buddharakkhitā arranging for secret marriages.[2] One may find parallels in the stories of Devasmitā in the Kathāsarit Sāgara[3] and of Nitambavatī in the Daśakumāracarita,[4] where the Buddhist female ascetics are represented as taking an active part in such indefensible affairs.[5] How far these references represent a real state of things this is not the place to discuss. But the Arthaśāstra also bears evidence to the fact that the religious orders in the 4th century B.C. were not free from such moral corruptions, although the cases of moral transgression were confined to a few individuals. It also goes to prove that with the rapid growth of a centralised form of government it was possible for Cāṇakya to organise a most elaborate system of espionage under which the services of all, whether recluses or householders, cultivators or traders, wise or idiot, male or female, could be utilised for the promotion of material advantages, and under which even a Kṣapaṇaka meditating on the reality of the living principle could easily be induced to serve the purpose of a state, as a tool in the hands of Cāṇakya. The Arthaśāstra devotes two chapters, XI and XII, to the subjects of training persons in espionage (gūḍhapuruṣôtpatti) and of employing spies in different branches of secret service (gūḍhapuruṣapraṇidhi). It appears from the rules laid down therein that spies were recruited, if possible, from among the

---

[1] Sāhitya-darpaṇa, III.157: Dūtyaḥ sakhī-naṭī pravrajitā."

[2] Jātaka, I. p. 257.

[3] Divyāvadāna, p. 427.

[4] Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 90.

[5] Jātaka, I. p. 493.

recluses of different orders, muṇḍas and jaṭilas, hermits and wanderers, males and females, who were seekers of livelihood (vṛittikāmā) by such clandestine means. The spies in the guise of female ascetics were employed to watch movements of persons in the harems (antaḥpure), the *siddha* hermits outside a fort, and the Śramans, if necessary, in a forest. The spies disguised as *muṇḍas*, *jaṭilas* or hermits had to live together with a large following in the suburbs of a city, pretending to subsist on pot-herbs and wheat, eating once at the interval of a month or two. Thus we have sufficient reasons to accept the Kṣapaṇaka of the Mudrārākṣasa as true to life, but the state of moral corruptions in which the Ājīvikas and the Jainas were implicated along with various other orders of ascetics was in no way peculiar to the age of Cāṇakya and Candragupta Maurya, for, as I expect to show in part II, these were among the natural adjuncts to the growth of the centralised forms of government and to the erection of monastic cloisters. Viśākhadatta's account of the intimacy of the Kṣapaṇaka with Malayaketu upholding the banner of Malaya country which, according to the Bhagavatī account, became a common stronghold of the Jainas and the Ājīvikas, and the use of a Kṣapaṇaka by Cāṇakya as a weapon against King Mahāpadma Nanda is of some historical importance. King Devasena Mahāpauma of Puṇḍa is described in the Bhagavatī, as we have seen, as a patron of the Ājīvikas, and it is not improbable that the Jaina Sūtra has confounded the emperor of Magadha with a petty chief of a country at the foot of the Viñjhā mountains. The very name of King Mahāpauma's capital Sayaduvāra, a city with a hundred gates reminds one of a magnificient metropolis like Pāṭaliputra.

The Divyâvadāna mentions Piṅgalavatsa as an Ājīvika who was employed in the service of king

Vindusāra as a court-astrologer,[1] while a Jātaka story preserves an old tradition to the effect that astrology was almost a professien with the Ājīvikas even in the Buddha's life-time.[2] The Divyâvadāna testifies to the fact that Puṇḍavardhana was a stronghold of the Ājīvikas in the time of king Aśoka.[3] Prince Vītasoka was a patron of the Ājīvikas who are confounded, as noticed by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar, with the Nirgranthas or Jainas.[4] He was a strong believer in physical torture which the Buddhist considered useless (micchātapa).[5] The conflict of claims involved between the two standpoints is clearly brought out in the following verses :

1. Buddhist thesis—

Na nagnacaryā na jaṭā na paṅko nānāśanaṁ sthandilaśāyikā vā
na rajomalaṁ nôtkuṭukaprahāṇam viśodhayen moham
aviśīrṇakāṅkham.
Alaṁkṛitaṁ câpi careta dharamaṁ dāntêndriyaḥ śāntaḥ
saṁyato brahmacārī
sarveṣu bhūteṣu nidhāya daṇ ḍaṁ sa brāmaṇaḥ sa śramaṇaḥ
sa bhikṣuḥ.[6]

2. Ājīvika antithesis—

Kaṣṭe'smin vijane vane nivasatāṁ vāyavambu-mūlâśinām
rāgo naiva jito yadiha ṛiṣiṇā kālaprakarṣena hi
Bhuktvânnaṁ saghṛitaṁ prabhūtapiśitaṁ dadhyûttamâlaṁkṛitaṁ
Śākyesvindriyanigraho yadi bhaved Vindhyaḥ plavet sāgare.[7]

The Divyâvadāna also relates that 18,000 Ājīvikas at Puṇḍavardhana had to pay a heavy toll of death in

---

[1] Mālatī Mādhava, Bombay Sanskrit Series, Act 1, p. 9.

[2] Kathāsarit Sāgara, Taraṅga XIII, No. 68.

[3] Daśakumāracarita, Cal. edition, p. 121.

[4] *Cf.* Telang's introduction to the Mudrārākṣasa, p. 19.

[5] Divyâvadāna, p. 339. *Cf.* Dhammapada, verse 141-142; Mahābhārata, III, verse 13455; Suttanipāta, verse 249.

[6] Divyâvadāna, p. 420. *Cf.* Bhattṛihari's oft-quoted śloka :—
Viśvāmitra-Parāśara-prabhṛitayo vātâmbu-parṇâśanāḥ; te' pi strīnāṁ śrīmukha-paṅkajāṁ dṛiṣṭvâpi mohaṁgatāḥ
Śakânnaṁ sághṛitaṁ payodadhiyutaṁ ye bhuñjate mānavasteṣāṁ indriyanigraho yadi bhavet paṅgustaret sāgaraṁ.

[7] The Ājīvikas are wrongly described as Nirgrantha upāsakas.

one day in the hands of King Aśoka for the fault of one Nirgrantha upāsaka[1] who had dishonoured the Buddha-image. Deeply grieved at similar sacrilege committed by another Nirgrantha upāsaka at Pāṭaliputra, the king burned him alive together with his kinsmen, and announced by a royal proclamation that the reward of a *Dināra* would be given to a person who could produce the head of a Nirgrantha, with the result that his own brother prince Vītaśoka was found among the victims.[2] It is inconceivable that king Aśoka was ever implicated in such an atrocious crime as the Divyâvadāna would have us believe. The tradition just referred to must be regarded as spurious and baseless for the simple reason that the Buddha is nowhere represented by an image in any sculpture which can be dated in Aśokan age. We are aware, moreover, that King Aśoka in his seventh Pillar Edict, where he sums up the various measures adopted by him towards the propagation of *dhamma*, expressly states that he had employed his Dharmamahāmātras for dispensing the royal favour to, and exercising supervision over, the Brāhmans, the Ājīvikas and the Jainas, as among all other sects.[2] Furthermore, the king elsewhere[3] declares that he granted two cave-dwellings to the Ājīvikas when he had been consecrated twelve years.

That the Ājīvikas continued to enjoy certain amount of respect from the people of Magadha and retained a hold

[1] Divyâvadāna, p. 427; Puṇḍavardhane .... ekadivase aṣṭādaśasahasrāṇyājīvikānāṁ praghātitāni.

[2] Devānaṁ piye Piyadasi hevaṁ āhā: Dhaṁma Mahāmātâpi me te bahuvidhesu aṭhesu ānugahikesu viyāpaṭā........se saṁghatasi pi me kaṭe ime viyāpaṭā hohaṁtiti; hemeva bābhanesu ājīvikesu pi me kaṭe ime viyāpaṭā hohaṁtiti; nigaṁthesu pi me kaṭe ime viyāpaṭā hohaṁti; nānāpāsaṁdesu pi me kaṭe ime viyāpaṭā hohaṁtiti. Paṭivisiṭhaṁ paṭīvisiṭhaṁ tesu tesu te te mahāmātā dhaṁmamahāmātā cu me etesu ceva viyāpaṭā savesu ca aṁnesu pāsaṁḍesu.

[3] *i.e.*, in his Cave Inscriptions: (1) Lājinā Piyadasinā duvāḍasavasābhi (sitenā) iyaṁ nigohakubhā dinā ājīvikehi: (2) Lājinā Piyadasinā duvāḍasavasābhisitenā iyaṁ kubhā khalatikapavatasi dinā ājīvikehi.

on the liberality of the Mauryas even after the reign of Aśoka is proved by the three cave dedications in the Nāgārjuni Hills, made by King Daśaratha, who perhaps succeeded his grandfather Aśoka in the throne of Magadha. No inscription has been found as yet recording gifts to any other sect, particularly to Buddhists which one might well expect from him, seeing that he was the grandson and successor of the greatest Buddhist Emperor of India. The presumption is that whatever his faith may have been, his mind was obsessed with the Ājīvika creed. The Ājīvika influence continued in Northern India to the end of the Maurya rule, to the time of Patañjali who is placed by modern scholars in *circa* 150 B.C. For we have noticed that Patañjali in his comment on Pāṇini's Sūtra, VI. 1. 154, was not content with calling the Maskariṇa a Maskariṇa simply because he carried a bamboo staff about him, but went a step further in suggesting that the name Maskarī also signified that he taught "mā kṛitakarmāṇi, mā kṛitakarmāṇi," *i.e.*, "don't perform actions, don't perform actions, &c.," which he could not have done in departure from the original sūtra of Pāṇini, if he had no personal acquaintance with the views of the Maskariṇas.

The Milindapañho (*circa* 1st century A.D.) takes some notice of the fatalistic creed of Makkhali Gosāla, who is wrongly represented as a contemporary of Milinda (Menander B.C. 155), the Indo-Bactrian king of Sāgala.[1] The Milinda account is in essence the same as that which is to be found in the Sāmaññaphala Sutta, with this important difference that it interprets Gosāla's doctrine of fate as being completely adapted to the rigid caste-system of the Brāhmans.[2] Such an interpretation of his doctrine of fate

[1] Milinda, pp. 4-5.

[2] *Ibid*, p. 5: N'atthi......Kusalâkusalāni kammāni, n'atthi sukaṭadukkaṭānaṁ kammānaṁ phalaṁ vipāko,......ye te idhaloke khattiyā te paralokaṁ gantvā ip puna khattiyā va bhavissanti, etc.

as this would seem incompatible with his general theory of evolution, teaching that even a dew-drop is destined to attain perfection through transmigration. It would be interesting, nevertheless, if the historian could prove that the Ājīvika creed found its adherents in the cosmopolitan city of Sāgala, situated not far from Alasanda dīpa (the island of Alexandria), enumerated in the Mahāniddesa as an important port.[1] Here I would just call attention to two controversies in the Milinda which have reference to the common views and practices of the Ājīvikas and the Jainas:

(1) the controversy as to whether water is a living substance—"kiṁ......udakaṁ jīvati?"[2]

(2) the controversy as to whether suicide is a crime —"Na attānaṁ pātetabbaṁ?"[3]

The Bhagavatī Sūtra also refers to an Ājīviya committing religious suicide at Videha some centuries after Gosāla's death.[4] When the Chinese pilgrim Fa Hien visited India in the 5th Century A.D., he saw 96 different sects of Northern India in Sāvatthi, among whom he mentions only the followers of Devadatta by name. From this it is not clear that the Ajīvikas retained a hold at that time on Sāvatthi proper. Indeed the subsequent history of the Ajīvikas shows that the Ajīvikas found a stronghold outside the Middle Country.

Referring to Varāhamihira's list of religious orders laying down rules of ordination under different constellations and planets,[5] his commentator Utpala says that his enumeration was based on the authority of the Jaina

Mahāniddesa, p. 155. Rhys Davids is of opinion that it was an island in the Indus.

[2] Milinda p. 258.

[3] *Ibid*, p. 195.

[4] Hoernle's Appendix I, p. 14.

[5] Vṛihajjātaka, XV. 1.

[6] See extract from Utpala's commentary, quoted in Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 287.

teacher Kālakâcārya, and substantiates his position by citation of actual words of the latter.[1] Varāhamihira's list includes :

(1) Śākya, the wearer of scarlet robe.
(2) Ājīvika, the one-staff man.
(3) Bhikṣu, or Saṁnyāsin.
(4) Vṛiddhaśrāvaka, the skull bearer.
(5) Caraka, the wheel-bearer.
(6) Nirgrantha, the naked one.
(7) Vanyâśana, or hermit.[2]

There are two lists[3] of Kālakâcārya. The first list as explained by the commentator comprises :—

(1) Tāvasia=Tāpasika, hermit.
(2) Kāvālia=Kāpālika, skull bearer.
(3) Rattavaḍa=Raktapaṭa, one of scarlet robe.
(4) Eadaṇḍī=Ekadaṇḍī, one-staff-man.
(5) Jai=Yati.
(6) Caraa=Caraka.
(7) Khavaṇāi=Kṣapaṇaka.

The second list consists of

(1) Jalana=jvalana, sâgnika.
(2) Hara=Īśvarabhakta, God-worshipper, *i.e.*, Bhaṭṭāraka.
(3) Sugaya=Sugata, *i.e.*, Buddhist.
(4) Keśava=Keśavabhakta, worshipper of Keśava, *i.e.*, Bhāgavata.
(5) Sui=Śrutimārgarata, one adhering to the rule of śruti, *i.e.*, Mīmāṁsaka.

---

[1] Śākyo raktapaṭah......Ājīvikas caikadaṇḍī .....bhikṣur bhavati saṁñyāsī jñeyaḥ ......Vṛiddhaśrāvakaḥ kāpāli......carako cakradharaḥ......Nirgrantho nagnaḥ kṣapaṇakaḥ......vanyâśanaḥ tapasvī.

[2] See extract from Utpala's Commentary in Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 287.

[3] Bühler's "Barābar and Nāgārjuni hill-cave inscriptions of Aśoka and Daśaratha," J.B.A.S., Vol. XX, p. 362. Cf. J. R. A. S., 1911, p. 960.

(6) Brahma=Brahmabhakta, worshipper of Brahmā *i.e.*, Vānaprastha.

(7) Nagga=Nagna, naked, *i.e.*, Kṣapaṇaka.

Professor D. R. Bhandarkar has rendered a great service by rectifying a fatal error in the interpretation of Utpala's commentary, which led such veteran Sanskritists as Professors Kern and Bühler to suppose that the Ājīvikas were the worshippers of Nārāyaṇa, *i.e.*, Bhāgavatas.[1] But now thanks to Prof. Bhandarkar no one doubts that Utpala's meaning was just the contrary. The Ājīvikas and the Bhāgavatas furnished him with a typical instance whereby he could illustrate *upalakṣaṇa*, a figure of Rhetoric used in characterising what a word does not denote.

"Ājīvikagrahaṇaṁ ca Nārāyaṇâśritānām,"
i.e., to accept one as an Ājīvika is not to denote a worshipper of Nārāyaṇa.[1]

Thus we see that the Ājīvika or Ekadaṇḍin formed a distinct element among the religious sects known to Varāhamihira (circa A.D. 525), the celebrated astronomer who is said to have been one of the nine gems adorning the court of King Vikramāditya of Ujjain, the capital of eastern Malwa and formerly that of Avanti in the Deccan. The Harṣacarita goes to prove that King Harṣa, whose reign in the 7th century A.D. was characterised by eclecticism in popular religion,[2] brought together the different religious sects and adherents of different schools in his dominion, where he listened to their respective views (svān svān siddhāntāni),[3] and the Kumbha-melā taking place at the interval of twelve years is a modern institution which serves the same purpose of bringing together the different sects from the various parts of the

[1] Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 288. Early History of the Vaishnava Sect, p. 116.

[2] Smith's Early History of India, 3rd edition, p. 345.

[3] Harṣacarita, Nirṇaya Sāgara Press edition, VIII, p. 265

country. These sects and schools in the Harṣacarita included among others:

(1) Maskaris=parivrājakas as the commentary calls them;

(2) Śvetapaṭas=a sect of the Jainas, distinguished as naked, *i.e.*, Digambaras;

(3) Pāṇḍus=Bhikṣus;

(4) Bhāgavatas=the worshippers of Viṣṇu, *i.e.*, Vaiṣṇavas;

(5) Varṇis=Brahmacāris;

(6) Keśaluñcanas (?)

(7) Kāpils=Sāṁkhyas;

(8) Jainas=Buddhists;

(9) Lokāyatikas=Cārvākas;

(10) Kāṇādas=Vaiśeṣikas;

(11) Aupaniṣadas=Vedāntins;

(12) Aiśvarakāraṇikas=Naiyāyikas;

(13) Karandhas=Hetuvādins;

(14) Dharmaśāstris=Smṛitijñas;

(15) Śābdas=Vaiyākaraṇas, grammarians;

(16) Pancarātras=a division of the Vaiṣṇavas.

There are three points about this list which are of the greatest historical importance:

(*a*) that the name *maskarī* is used to denote the wanderers in general, a significant fact showing that the Ājīvikas did not give up their nomadic habits up till the 7th century A.D., and that in this respect they were not a solitary instance;

(*b*) that the commentator uses the term Buddhist as a synonym of the Jaina (Jainair bauddhaiḥ); and

(*c*) that the list includes, among others, the schools of Hindu philosophy, Kāpila, Kāṇāda, etc., whose names can be traced neither in the texts that are pre-Asokan in date, nor in the Brahmanical works that can be dated as pre-Pāṇinian.

As regards the first point, it is important to note that the Amarakoṣa counts the Maskarī among the five classes of saṁnyāsins,[1] while in Vīranandi's Ācārasāra (Śaka 1076) the Ājīvaka is distinguished from a *Parivrāṭ* or wandering mendicant practising very severe austerities,[2] and in two later Jaina and Buddhist works the *ekadaṇḍin* and the *tridaṇḍin* are enumerated as two divisions of Parivrājakas[3] or Paramahaṁsas who aspired to develop in them the divine faculties through renunciation of all worldly concerns.[4]

With regard to the second point, it may be noticed that it is not a solitary instance where the Jaina[5] has been confounded with the Buddhist, for there are other cases, where the Ājīvika has been confounded with the Jaina,[6] and the Buddhist with the Ājīvika.[7] Indeed, such confusions of sects as these have no meaning in history except as showing that the sects thus confounded the one with the other appeared to have a close kinship between them to the eye of an outsider. Accordingly the meaning of the passage of the Divyâvadāna confounding the Ājīvika with the Jaina is that the two sects living side by side at Puṇḍavardhana differed so slightly from each other, whether in their views or in their outward appearances, that it was difficult for a

---

[1] Amarakoṣa, VII. 5. 42.

[2] Ācārasāra, XI. 127: Parivrāḍ...ugracāravānapi ājīvakaḥ. See Pathak's 'Ājīvikas,' Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 89.

[3] Mādhavacandra's Commentary on the Triloka-sāra, verse 545: ekadaṇḍi-tridaṇḍi-lakṣaṇāḥ parivrājakāḥ, *Ibid*, p. 91.

[4] Sarojavajra's Dohākoṣa: Eka(va) daṇḍi tridaṇḍi bhava veseñ viṇṇā hosa hañsa uvesañ. Advayavajra in his comments on the above says: ekadaṇḍi-tridaṇḍi bhagavaveśaṁ bhavati......yāvan na paramahaṁsa-veśaṁ bhavati tāvajj-ñānaṁ na labhyate sarvasannyāsatvāt. See Shastry's Bauddha Gān-o-Dohā, pp. 82-84.

[5] Divyâvadāna, p. 42.

[6] Commentary on the Ācārasāra, XI. 127: "ājīvikaḥ bauddhabhedam", *i.e.*, "the Ajīvika, a division of the Buddhists."

[7] Kauṭilya, Arthaśāstra, p. 3.

Buddhist observer to draw any sharp distinction between them. Similarly with reference to the passage where the commentator of the Harṣacarita identifies the Jaina other than the Śvetâmbara with the Buddhist, the historian is to understand either that his suggestion was based upon hearsay or that he had kept in view some particular sect of the Buddhist faith who closely resembled the Jaina, *e.g.*, the sect of Devadatta that existed in Sāvatthi, as appears from Fa-Hien's account, to the end of the 4th century A.D., and a remnant of whose practices the Chinese pilgrim Hiuen Tsiang found to be in use at Karṇasuvarṇa in Eastern Bengal[1] in the time of King Harṣavardhana. The followers of Devadatta were not Buddhists in the sense that they did not pay homage to Gotama Buddha, but they must be said to have been Buddhists in the sense that they showed reverence to three previous Buddhas.

As to the third point relating to the schools of Hindu philosophy, the orthodox Hindu who is taught to believe that everything was done for him in a finished form by the Ṛiṣis of old, long before the appearance of two powerful heresies, known as Jainism and Buddhism, will be sorry to be told that the Kauṭilya Arthaśāstra is the oldest known Sanskrit text of which the date can be definitely placed either in the 4th or in the 2nd century B.C., and which mentions the Sāṁkhya, the Yoga and the Lokāyata among the typical instances of speculative philosophy (ānvīkṣakī).[1] So far as the Buddhist literature is concerned, the Milinda-Pañho is the oldest text which includes the Sāṁkhya, the Yoga, the Nīti and the Visesikā in the list of the various sciences and arts studied by King Menander in the 2nd century B.C.

[1] Milinda-Pañho, p. 3.

[2] Beal's Records of the Western World, II. p. 201; Smith's Early History of India, 3rd edition, p. 32.

The subsequent history of the Ājīvikas has to be built up from a few stray references to them in literature and epigraphic records, all indicating a process of rapid decay of their religious order, which lingered with varied fortune in different parts of India, particularly in the Deccan proper. Prof. Pathak in his paper on the Ājīvikas has collected some important references from the Digambara Jaina works extant in the Canarese country.[1] In the oldest of them, dated Śaka 1076, the Ājīvikas are represented as a Buddhist denomination, and are said to have been entitled to existence in the heaven called Sahasrāra-kalpa, in contradistinction to the Hindu *Parivrāṭ*, whose aspiration did not reach beyond the Brahma-world.[2] In another work belonging to the same age, the Ājīvikas entitled to the immutable state are distinguished similarly from the *Carayas* and the *Parimbajas*.[3] In a third work, the *Carakas* are characterised as naked, while the *Ekadaṇḍin* and the *Tridaṇḍin* are enumerated as two main divisions of the Parivrājakas.[4] In the fourth, the Ājīvikas are represented as a Buddhist denomination subsisting on Kaṁji,[5] while in the fifth belonging to the 13th century they are distinguished from the Buddhists who were meat-eaters.[6] From these references Prof. Pathak is led to conclude that "the Ājīvikas were well-known to the Jaina authors of the later Chālukya and Yādava periods as a sect of Buddhist Bhikshus who lived solely or chiefly on Kaṁji.[7]"

---

[1] Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 88 f.

[2] Vīranandi's Ācārasāra, XI. 127 : Parivrāḍ brahmakalpâṁtaṁ yātyugracāravānapi, Ājīvikaḥ sahasrārakalpâṁtaṁ darśanojjhitaḥ.

[3, 4] Trilokasāra, verse 545 : Carayā ya pariṁbajā bahmoti, aṁcuda-padoṁ'ti ājīvā.

[5] Commentary on the Ācārasāra, XI. 127 : Ājīvakaḥ bauddhabhedam appakaṁji bhikṣu. *Cf.* Padmaprabha's Traividya (Circa., 1400 A.D.) : Ājīvā ambila-kūḷan umbaru.

[6] Buddhist argument in favour of meat-eating is said to be :—

Pātre patitaṁ pavitraṁ sūktrôktaṁ ideṁdu bauddhar adagaṁ timbaru. See Māghanandi's Śrāvakâcāra.

[7] Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 90.

A few inscriptions have been found in Madras Presidency belonging to the first half of the 13th century, which record that a kind of poll-tax was imposed on the Ājīvikas.[1] The reasons for imposition of this tax are nowhere stated, but the reactionary measure thus adopted by the Hindu rulers of South India was certainly not without its effect on the career of the Ājīvikas; probably it served to check the further progress of the Ājīvika movement or to compel the Ājīvikas by external pressure to merge their identity in the Shivaite and other orders of Hindu ascetics.

Thus the post-Makkhali history of the Ājīvikas ranging over twenty centuries is to be conceived as a long and intricate process of religious development in the country which led ultimately to the extinction of the sect. The foregoing investigation has shown that the Ājīvika movement which commenced in the 7th or the 8th century B. C., somewhere near the Gangetic valley, and was confined at first to the tract of land between Campā and Benares, gradually extended to Sāvatthi. Within a few centuries of Gosāla's death this movement crossed at many points the territorial limits of the Middle country. Gayā and Puṇḍavardhana were two important centres of the Ājīvika activity in the time of King Asoka. At the time when the Jaina Bhagavatī Sūtra was compiled their influence was diffused over the whole of Northern India from the Bay of Bengal to the Gulf of Cutch. Towards the close of the Maurya rule the Bactrian city of Sāgala in the Punjab became a centre of liberal movements, while the kingdom of Avanti in the Deccan in its earlier territorial extension long remained an important scene of the Ājīvika propaganda. The centre of gravity shifted after Harṣa to

[1] Hultzsh's South Indian Inscriptions, Vol. I, pp. 88, 89, 92 and 108. *Cf.* Ind. Ant., 1912, p. 288.

the Deccan proper, where, especially in the Canarese country, they encountered many reverses of fortune till they finally disappeared in the fourteenth century of the Christian era. The pathetic story of maltreatment of the Ājīvikas and other ascetics in Rāḍha by its rude inhabitants need not be recounted. Similar experiences of the hermits of the Vānaprastha order in other non-Aryan tracts are recorded in the Araṅyakāṇḍa of the Rāmāyaṇa and several stories of the Jātaka. This naturally suggests a most fruitful enquiry as to the part they played in the annals of Aryan colonisation and propagation of Aryan culture, followed everywhere by non-Aryan reaction, and modified by the race-cult and national characteristics which it absorbed. Moreover, in carrying on the study of the post-Makkhali history of the Ājīvikas, the historian cannot but set himself to analyse the causes of the decline of the Ājīvika faith, and it is certain that such an enquiry cannot be undertaken apart from the development of various religious movements and schools of philosophy which went to rob the Ājīvika movement of its especiality. The simultaneous processes of absorption and assimilation which seem so largely accountable for the disappearance of the Ājivikas involve two questions of far-reaching importance, which are:

(1) Where are the Ājīvikas who maintained their existence among the rival sects up till the fourteenth century A. D., if not later?

(2) Is it that the Ajīvika system dwindled into insignificance without enriching the systems which supplanted and supplemented it?

Finally, if it be admitted that truth never dies and that the Ājīvikas had a distinct message for Indian peoples, the history of the Ājīvikas cannot be concluded without a general reflection on the course of Indian history, nor

can the historian discharge his true function as historian without determining the place of the Ājīvikas in the general scheme of Indian history as a whole.

14 DAY USE

RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED

LOAN DEPARTMENT

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or on the date to which renewed.
Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

~~Due end of SPRING Quarter~~ subject to recall after —	APR 5 '72 26
REC'D LD JUN	8 72-8 AM 8
Milliken	
Univ	
INTERLIBRARY LOAN	
APR 1 0 1974	
UNIV. OF CALIF., BERK.	
JUN 5 - 1975 1 6	

LD 21–40m-2,'69
(J6057s10)476—A-32

General Library
University of California
Berkeley